# The New-York Times.

VOL. XXIV.....NO. 7309. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1875.—WITH SUPPLEMENT. PRICE FOUR CENTS.


## WASHINGTON.

*DEBATE ON THE BILL TO INCREASE THE REVENUE.*

OPPOSITION TO THE WHISKY AND TOBACCO CLAUSES—THE JAPANESE INDEMNITY FUND DISTRIBUTION — THE PEABODY SCHOOL IN FLORIDA—A QUESTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS.

*Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.*

WASHINGTON, Feb. 18.—The consideration of the Revenue Bill was resumed to-day in the House, immediately after reading the journal, and general debate was limited to three and a quarter hours. Mr. Burchard, of the Ways and Means Committee, contended there was a necessity for providing additional revenue, and believed, with the exception of the section restoring ten per cent. duties on certain articles, the bill reported was a just and practicable method of providing the additional revenue required. To restore the ten per cent. duties would disturb a great many industries, and affect at least a thousand million dollars. That section of the bill was intended to furnish protection to manufacturers of cotton and iron and steel, rather than to raise revenue. It was in the interest of the few at the expense of the many. Messrs. Cox, Niblack, and Beck opposed the bill as being unnecessary at this time, and expressed the belief that with proper economy in expenditures, a strict adherence to the laws now in existence, and an honest collection of the revenue, no additional tax need be imposed. The Western men manifest a determined opposition to the tax on whisky, and Messrs. Sayler and Banning, of Ohio; Ward, of Illinois, and Bright, of Tennessee, spoke earnestly against the first section. Ward and Saylor argued that the imposition of tax on whisky was a discrimination against the West, and would force that section to pay more than one-half of all the additional revenue estimated for in the bill. They contrasted the amount of tax paid by New-England and the West, and said a single revenue district in Illinois or Ohio paid more revenue to the Government than was paid by all the New-England States. Mr. Dawes denied that the people of the West, or those who manufactured whisky, paid the tax. The manufacturer merely advanced the tax on whisky and tobacco, and the people in the East and other sections who consumed their manufactures were required to pay back the advances ten-fold. The importers of Boston pay annually over $20,000,000 revenue, and those of New-York $240,000,000, but no one contended the duty advanced by them was not returned by the consumer, with interest. No one section of the country would be affected more than another by the tax on whisky and tobacco, since those articles were used by all sections and classes. Mr. Ward thought the people of the East had nothing to tax but wealth and capital, and a tax should be imposed on that. Mr. Harris, of Virginia, and others protested against the increased tax on tobacco, using the same line of general argument as was used by those opposing the tax on whisky, and contending that it was a tax on the products of the soil. Mr. Kasson advocated the bill, and read dispatches from distillers of Peoria, who pay $400,000 tax annually, and who say, if there is necessity for increased revenue, they don't object to the imposition of the increase on spirits to be manufactured after March 1, but object to taxing whisky on hand. When the general debate closed, several amendments were proposed, and discussion was resumed under the five minutes' rule. A motion was entered to strike out the first section. Mr. Garfield moved a substitute for the first section, providing that spirits on hand should be taxed, and fixing the tax on spirits hereafter manufactured at eighty-five cents, instead of $1. Mr. Gunckel, of Ohio, moved the proviso taxing stock on hand as an amendment to Mr. Garfield's substitute. Mr. Cox offered as an amendment to perfect the original bill, to come in at the end of the first section, a clause increasing the duty on imported champagne, in quarts from $6 to $9 per dozen, and in pints from $3 to $4 50 per dozen. Mr. Kelley, of Pennsylvania, moved a further amendment to the original bill, providing that no tax should be imposed on spirits of wine used in the manufacturing arts. This amendment, Mr. Kelley claimed, was in the exact words of an act of the British Parliament. These several propositions gave rise to considerable discussion, and as they were all pending at the same time members became confused, and frequent inquiry was made of the Chair to ascertain what was the proposition to be voted upon, and what effect its adoption or rejection would have on other propositions pending. Mr. Kelley's motion was rejected, only twenty-eight members standing up for free spirits of wine. Mr. Cox's amendment to increase duties on imported champagne was agreed to, as was Gunckel's amendment to Garfield's substitute for the first section of the bill. Mr. Garfield's substitute was then rejected, leaving the section just as it was reported by the committee, with the addition of the amendment proposed by Mr. Cox. The committee then rose. The consideration of the bill will be resumed to-morrow. What will finally be done with the first section, taxing whisky, is in great doubt, but striking it out would render the substitution of tea and coffee necessary, or the bill would fail to accomplish its purpose of providing revenue. It is thought that at least the tax on stock in bond and in the hands of dealers will be stricken out. It looks as if the tobacco and whisky men would act in concert in relation to those two interests, and the action on whisky may indicate what the action on tobacco will be. The evening was, by special order made on Monday, assigned to the Judiciary Committee, and the Revenue bill was therefore laid aside with the end of the afternoon session till to-morrow.

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The railroad men and border ruffians have become convinced that their attempts to open the Indian Territory will fail for this session, and they are resorting to new tactics for the purpose of getting the subject more directly before Congress at the next session. They are endeavoring to arrange for the appointment of a special committee of the Senate, and will probably succeed. This committee is to visit the Indian Territory during the next Summer and to investigate the condition of affairs, and report generally what legislation is necessary. The people who have been pushing the Territorial bill here this Winter hope that they will get a committee favorable to their project, and a report will give them a better starting point for action than they have had this Winter.

BILL FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE JAPANESE INDEMNITY.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has agreed to report a bill providing for the distribution of the Japanese indemnity fund, which now amounts to nearly $1,900,000. The amount already paid by Japan, and which has been invested in United States bonds under the direction of the State Department, amounts to nearly $900,000. The balance due, $375,000 in gold, is now in England en route from Japan to the United States. In May, 1872, a bill was passed by the House remitting the last-named sum, but failed to be enacted. At the last session a similar bill was reported favorably to the Senate, and was pending at the adjournment. Ever since the indemnity was received from Japan efforts have been made at every session of Congress to pass bills distributing a certain portion of the indemnity among the officers and crew of the United States ships Wyoming and To Kiang, which participated in the action which resulted in destroying the pirates at Simonoseki Strait in 1863. It is proposed in the bill agreed to by the Foreign Committee to remit to Japan the $375,000 now en route; distribute among the officers and crews of the Wyoming and To Kiang $125,000 of that already received and invested; place $300,000 under the direction of the Secretary of State, the interest to be devoted to the education of a certain number of American and Japanese youths in the Japanese language, in order to enable them to become interpreters for our Consular and Diplomatic service, and the balance to be turned into the Treasury. The President, in his annual Message, recommended the education of interpreters for our diplomatic service, and the Secretary of State has expressed himself favorable to that section of the bill, but would prefer to have the entire balance of the fund devoted to educational purposes.

THE PEABODY SCHOOL BILL.

The vote by which the bill to grant a site for the Peabody School in St. Augustine, Fla., passed a few days ago was reconsidered to-day by a vote of 31 to 25. Messrs. Lewis, Boreman, Morrill of Vermont, Sprague, Tipton, Gilbert, Sherman, and Sargent voting with the Democrats against the reconsideration. Mr. Boutwell spoke in favor of the reconsideration, giving as his reason for opposing the bill that as it now stood it excluded colored children from the school, and besides, he did not favor the gift of a lot of land here and there for school purposes. He thought some general system in regard to the promotion of education should be adopted.

*Dispatch to the Associated Press.*

ALABAMA CLAIMS COURT.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—In the Court of Commissioners of Alabama Claims to-day, case No. 325 continued from yesterday, was taken up, and the testimony completed. The evidence in cases No. 147, Dodge against the United States; 148, Lucas against the United States, and No. 325, Boyd vs. the United States, being applicable to each, and all having been finished, the several cases were argued together. H. H. Wells, for the claimants, and Hon. John A. J. Creswell for the United States. The time of the court being fully occupied with these cases, the calendar was postponed until to-morrow.

THE IMPORTATION OF CHINESE AND JAPANESE WOMEN.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs to-day agreed to report a bill supplementary to the acts in relation to immigration, which seeks to prevent the importation of women from China, Japan, or any Oriental country for lewd and immoral purposes, the violation of the law to be visited with severe penalties.

THE POSTAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations to-day finished the consideration of the Postal Appropriation bill, and it will be reported to the Senate without any material changes from the provisions agreed to by the House, except the insertion of a clause providing that the weighing of the mails on railroad routes shall be done by employes of the Post Office Department.

BILLS APPROVED.

The President has approved the joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a Commissioner to attend the International Penitentiary Congress at Rome. Also, the act to facilitate the disposition of cases in the Supreme Court of the United States and for other purposes.

FINANCIAL MATTERS.

The receipts from internal revenue sources to-day were $628,767. The Customs receipts for the week ending Feb. 15 were as follows: New-York, $2,627,421; Boston, $292,216; Philadelphia, $172,701; Baltimore, $125,219; New-Orleans, (week ending Feb. 6,) $24,942.

TREASURY BALANCES.

The following were the balances in the Treasury at the close of business to-day: Currency, $7,838,308; special deposits of legal tenders for the redemption of certificates of deposit, $50,110,000; coin, $70,662,159; including coin certificates, 22,274,900; outstanding legal tenders, $382,000,000.

### *LOSSES BY FIRE.*

The largest fire that ever took place in West Hoboken occurred between 12 and 1 o'clock yesterday afternoon. The fire originated in the kitchen of John Wolf's grocery store, on Paterson avenue, and so rapid was the progress of the flames that in less than two hours the whole block of frame buildings was burned to the ground. The wells in the immediate vicinity of the fire were partly frozen, and the fire companies in the town found great difficulty in combating the flames. Chief Engineer Heuston telegraphed to Chief Engineer Farrier, of the Jersey City Fire Department, for aid. That officer, with Steam Fire Engine Companies Nos. 4, 7, 11, and 12, with Hook and Ladder No. 4, was on the ground while the fire was at its height. The steam-engines threw a steady stream on the flames, and succeeded in confining the conflagration to the block bounded by Clinton Courtlandt, and Paterson avenues. Mr. Wolf lost two buildings, the one occupied by himself as a grocery and food store, and another as a dry goods store. Loss, $20,000. Max Kovert owned the house adjoining as a drug store. He estimates his loss on furniture and stock at $10,000. Messrs. Isaacs and Josephs, owners of the two adjoining buildings on Paterson avenue, lose about $12,000. Mr. Alexander Lesley, owner of the house on Clinton street, valued his building at $2,000. Sparks set fire to the old Red House on Clinton street, and damaged the roof about $500. The total loss is estimated at $50,000.

The business portion of the village of Woodhull, Steuben County, N. Y., was nearly destroyed by fire yesterday morning. Three dry-goods stores, a drug store, and several small buildings occupied as shops and saloons were burned.

Watson's steam tannery, at Fergus, Ontario, was destroyed by fire on Tuesday night. The loss is $15,000.

### *THE ELECTION IN PHILADELPHIA.*

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 17.—The election yesterday for Councils, resulted in the choice of twenty-two Republicans and seven Democrats to the Select, and fifty-five Republicans and fifteen Democrats to the Common Council. In the Third Ward, James L. Marshall, Democrat, was elected by twelve plurality, over Harry Hunter, to fill the vacancy in the State Legislature, caused by the death of William H. Fagan.

### *THE CAPE COD FISHERMEN.*

GLOUCESTER, Mass., Feb. 17.—All hope of the safety of the fishing schooners Joseph Chandler and David Burnham, (2d,) of this port, who have been absent upon trips to the Grand Banks since Dec. 1, has been given up, and they are regarded as lost with their crews, numbering in all twenty-four men.

### *THE POTOMAC RIVER CLOSED.*

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—The Potomac River has been closed for several days from its mouth to this city, a distance of about one hundred miles, and to-day, for the first time in many years, an ice-boat arrived here from Point Lookout.

## THE SOUTHERN QUESTION.

*THE LOUISIANA COMPROMISE.*

DEPARTURE OF A CONSERVATIVE COMMITTEE FOR WASHINGTON—MR. WHEELER'S PROPOSITION.

*Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.*

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—Mr. Wheeler received a dispatch to-day from New-Orleans, stating that a committee of the Conservative Legislature had left for Washington to renew the negotiations for a compromise of the political disturbances in that State. The dispatch contains the further information that thirty members of the Conservative caucus have signed an agreement to accept the first proposition which was drawn up by Mr. Wheeler. It is hardly possible now that there can be any legislation in Congress to settle the status of the Louisiana State Government; indeed, there has been no time since the session convened that the shrewdest politicians in Congress expected any action by both Houses, although it has been possible that the Senate might admit Pinchback, and thus give a quasi opinion on the validity of the Kellogg Government. There is a disposition on the part of those men who are pressing the caucus bill to keep the Louisiana matter open, that the unsettled condition of affairs may operate to gain votes for their measure. Whenever the prospect of any Southern legislation has become hopeless to all, there will be a better chance than now for a proposal of compromise to succeed. Thus far the Conservatives and Democrats have been responsible for the failure of agreement. If the proposition made by Mr. Wheeler should be accepted by the majority of the Conservative caucus, and should fail afterward because opposed by Republicans here, the responsibility would, of course, be shifted. Of one thing there can be no room for doubt, if the leaders of both political parties sincerely desired peace in Louisiana more than partisan advantages in other parts of the country, a settlement would soon be effected, full of promise that the turbulence of the last few months should come to an end.

CAUCUS OF THE CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS.

NEW-ORLEANS, Feb. 17.—The Conservative caucus assembled this morning. Fifty-four members answered the roll-call, after which the caucus went into executive session. Several dispatches from the delegation in Washington were read, the contents of which have not transpired. The caucus then adjourned until to-morrow.

### *THE LOUISIANA SENATORSHIP.*

THE RESOLUTION FOR THE ADMISSION OF PINCHBACK—SPEECHES OF SENATORS FERRY AND STEVENSON.

*Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.*

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—The brief speech of Mr. Ferry, of Connecticut, in the Senate to-day on the resolution to admit Pinchback, was one of the manly and vigorous arguments for which the Senator is distinguished. It left no doubt of his position nor of the strength and the deep conviction by which he held it. He referred to the precedents quoted by Mr. Morton, and said it seemed to him that the Senator had not even touched the question. Really before the Senate all the precedents quoted by him were equally applicable to the credentials of McMillan. He argued that the Senate was absolutely compelled to go behind the certificate of election, and the evidence taken by the committee of the Senate showed Kellogg did not receive a majority of the votes, and had not even the color of a title to the office of Governor. Kellogg's signature to the certificate of election presented by Pinchback, gave the certificate no authority or virtue. He spoke of the dangerous precedent which would be set by the admission of Pinchback, and asked what better one could be set to be followed by a Democratic President than the one proposed now. He appealed to those members of the majority who entertained similar views to those held by him not to sit there, content with giving a silent vote, but to speak to the Senate and the country against the proposed action and prevent such a precedent from being established.

Senator Ferry was followed by Senator Stevenson, of Kentucky, in a long speech against the resolution, during which he went over the history of the whole Louisiana trouble. Upon the conclusion of his speech a recess was ordered till 7:30 o'clock in the evening.

### *ALABAMA AFFAIRS.*

THE REPORT OF THE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE—THE REPUBLICAN CAUCUS BILL INDORSED.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—The select committee appointed to investigate alleged political outrages in Alabama met to-day, and by a majority vote directed the Chairman, Gen. Coburn, of Indiana, to report to the House the bill which was recently indorsed by the Republican caucus. Messrs. Buckner and Luttrell, the two Democratic members, protested against making this bill the report of the committee, and insisted that they should first endeavor to agree upon a report concerning the especial subject of their investigation. Their two votes were, however, overruled by those of Messrs. Coburn, Albright, and Cannon, and the bill will shortly be reported.

### *NORTH CAROLINA.*

INJUNCTION TO PROHIBIT ELECTIONS IN WILMINGTON FOR DISFRANCHISING NEGROES.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—Information has been received here that a motion was made to-day by D. L. Russell, counsel for plaintiffs, before Judge Bond, of the United States Circuit Court, at Baltimore, for an injunction to prohibit the holding of the municipal elections at Wilmington, N. C., on the ground that the charter recently adopted by the Legislature of North Carolina disfranchises colored people. The case is to be tried at Raleigh on the 6th of March.

### *THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT AT ALBANY.*

ALBANY, N. Y., Feb. 17.—The Assembly Committee on Internal Affairs heard a deputation to-day from various temperance societies against the two licensing bills before the House, and in favor of the prohibition bill. Mrs. Butler, Mrs. Reide, Mrs. Swanson, J. N. Stearns, Hon. B. E. Hale, Rev. Dr. Boole, and J. A. Mowatt addressed the committee. Several liquor-dealers watched the proceedings. At 8 o'clock this evening a mass-meeting was held in Tweddle Hall, when the same ladies and gentlemen delivered stirring addresses. Great enthusiasm prevailed in support of prohibition.

### *THE ICE BLOCKADE IN THE CHESAPEAKE BAY.*

FORTRESS MONROE, Va., Feb. 17.—Much inconvenience is experienced by the traveling public and shippers owing to the ice embargo in the Chesapeake Bay. The ice is very heavy as far down as the mouth of the Potomac. There has been no boat from Baltimore for the past ten days, and it is uncertain when one will arrive. Mails are received via Richmond and Norfolk, and merchants are now shipping oysters by that route in order to reach the Washington and Baltimore markets, where they command high prices. The steamer Lady of the Lake, recently burned at Norfolk, is still at that port waiting for the ice to break up, when she will be towed to Baltimore for repairs. She is under contract to be completed inside of sixty days, when she will again be put on the route between Washington and Norfolk. The steamer Jane Moseley has been purchased for this route, and a daily line will be put on about the 1st of May.

### *THE WEATHER.*

SYNOPSIS AND PROBABILITIES.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 18—1 A. M.—The barometer has risen in the Middle States, and higher temperature, north-west winds, and clear weather prevail over the Middle and East Atlantic coast. Northerly winds, cloudy and rainy weather continue in the South Atlantic and Gulf States. The rivers have fallen at Cincinnati, Cairo, Memphis, and Vicksburg.

PROBABILITIES.

During Thursday, in the South Atlantic States, falling barometer, colder, northerly winds, cloudy, and rainy, followed by clear weather.

For the Gulf States, rising barometer, northerly winds, colder, cloudy, and clearing weather.

For Tennessee and the Ohio Valley, stationary, followed by falling, barometer, southerly winds, and warmer, partly cloudy, weather.

For the Upper Mississippi and Lower Missouri Valleys, the North-west, and the upper lake region, falling barometer, south and east winds, warmer, cloudy, or partly cloudy weather.

*For the lower lake region, Middle and Eastern States, rising barometer, lower temperature, westerly winds, and generally clear weather, except, possibly, local snows in New-York.*

The rivers will continue to fall slowly.

IN THIS CITY.

The following record shows the changes in the temperature during the past twenty-four hours, in comparison with the corresponding date of last year, as recorded at Hudnut's Pharmacy:

| | 1874. | 1875. | | 1874. | 1875. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 A. M. | 29° | 12° | 3:30 P. M. | 31° | 37° |
| 6 A. M. | 28° | 11° | 6 P. M. | 29° | 32° |
| 9 A. M. | 28° | 22° | 9 P. M. | 22° | 19° |
| 12 M. | 30° | 32° | 12 P. M. | 20° | 14° |

Average temperature yesterday.....22⅜°

Average temperature for corresponding date last year.....27½°

### *CANADA.*

THE BUDGET—ESTIMATES FOR THE ENSUING YEAR.

OTTAWA, Ontario, Feb. 17.—Hon. Mr. Cartwright's budget speech extended over two and a half hours in delivery. No changes in the tariff were proposed. The estimated expenditure for 1875–6 is $24,857,000, (without reference to some probable supplementary estimates,) against $24,803,000, the sum asked for 1874–5. The estimated income of the coming year, in round figures, is as follows: Customs, $15,500,000; excise, $5,500,000; stamps, $250,000; Post Office, $1,050,000; public works, $1,700,000; other sources, $1,250,000, making a total of say about $25,250,000, leaving a surplus of $500,000.

Dr. Tupper, at considerable length, though with more moderation than on former occasions, criticised the statement of the Finance Minister. Other members also spoke, and a motion to go into Committee on Supplies was agreed to.

THE CORRESPONDENCE ON THE FISHERY QUESTION.

OTTAWA, Ontario, Feb. 17.—Mr. Mills intends moving an address to his Excellency for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of Great Britain in reference to the monetary compensation to be paid by the United States to Canada under the treaty of Washington for the liberty of fishing in Canadian waters. Also for any correspondence on the same subject between the Governments of Great Britain and the United States communicated to his Excellency for the information of the Canadian Government.

### *THE CHARGES AGAINST REV. THOMAS COOPER.*

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 17.—At a meeting of the Ecclesiastical Council of the Free Congregational Church of the United States to-day, a report was submitted from the committee to investigate the rumors about Rev. Mr. Cooper, of the Free Congregational Church of Frankford. The report states, in regard to the charges of criminal or immoral conduct against Rev. Thomas Cooper, that they are not proved; that he has not been as discreet in many respects as he ought to have been, they fully agree and he frankly owns. By inconsiderateness of conduct, by hasty words, and sometimes by following ill-advised counsel, Mr. Cooper has done much, taken in connection with unfavorable surrounding circumstances, to impair his usefulness as a minister of the Gospel, and to weaken the confidence of good men in Christian integrity. Were there no hope of improvement on his part in these particulars, we should feel compelled, notwithstanding his many other excellences and endowments, to recommend him to withdraw from the ministry. While the committee feel called upon to express censure to this extent, they do at the same time, and as mitigating facts, ask the council to consider the early associations of his boyhood in a foreign land, and among the poorer classes, where less strict notions of propriety prevail than do with us; and also the fact that for several years he was petted as the eloquent boy-preacher; and that now, after all these years of preaching, he is still younger than most of us were when we began our ministry. Let him become, as we trust his past experience and progressive years will lead him to be, prudent in word and deed, and he may yet—among a class of people whom most other ministers could not reach as he reaches them—be the means, under God, of great usefulness in the church and the world. The report expresses no opinion in regard to the civil suit pending against him in this city. The report was adopted.

### *BY MAIL AND TELEGRAPH.*

Numerous bold burglaries have been committed in New-Orleans during the past forty-eight hours.

The Jefferson County town meetings, held on Tuesday, resulted as follows: Republican, 14; Democratic, 12.

Hon. Herman Foster, one of the most prominent lawyers and politicians in New-Hampshire, died at Manchester yesterday.

The new Lutheran Church of the Holy Communion, on Broad and Arch streets, Philadelphia, was dedicated yesterday with imposing ceremonies.

The Rome, Watertown and Ogdensburg Railroad has been blockaded with snow between Watertown and Rome since the night of Wednesday, the 10th inst. It will be clear to-day.

The British ship Olive, reported abandoned on a voyage from Singapore for Boston, had a cargo valued at $200,000, which is largely insured in Boston offices. A quantity of tin on board was destined for New-York.

Trains were running regularly yesterday on the Great Falls and Conway Railroad. Between Madison and Conway, N. H., there is a drift of snow over a mile in length, with an average depth of eight to ten feet. A channel just wide enough for trains has been made through it.

### *FATAL RAILROAD ACCIDENT.*

WATERTOWN, N. Y., Feb. 17.—A train on the Utica and Black River Railroad ran over two men named Albert Mould and Charles Wright, near this city, to-day. The former was instantly killed and shockingly mutilated. The latter lost his right leg and was otherwise injured. The men were walking on the track at the time of the occurrence. A storm was raging and the engineer could not see them.

### *DEATH WARRANT SIGNED.*

HARRISBURG, Penn., Feb. 17.—Gov. Hartranft to-day issued a warrant for the execution, on Wednesday, the 17th day of March next, of Barney McCue, convicted in Lycoming County, on Dec. 1, 1874, of the murder of John Deter, and sentenced to be hanged.

## CONGRESS LAST NIGHT.

*THE NIGHT SESSION IN BOTH HOUSES.*

THE PINCHBACK CASE IN THE SENATE—DEMOCRATS PREPARED TO TALK A WEEK—A STOCK-JOBBING MOVEMENT ON WESTERN UNION—THE BILL IN THE HOUSE TO MAKE TELEGRAPH LINES POST ROADS.

*Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.*

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—At midnight the Senate is in session, and the resolution to admit Pinchback is under discussion. That there will be an all-night session seems certain. That a majority will hold together to keep the Senate in session for this debate would indicate that the resolution has more strength than has been anticipated for it, but several Senators have voted against adjournment who are pronounced in their opposition to Pinchback. One of the Senators thinks the debate will last till some time to-morrow, when Mr. Morrill will move to lay it aside for an Appropriation bill, and no more will be heard this session of the case of Pinchback. It can of course be made a subject of discussion and action in the executive session after the 4th of March. Pinchback's friends claim they have a majority which will be steadfast in maintaining the case before the Senate. The Democrats have declared they will talk till Saturday night before allowing a vote to be taken. Mr. Merrimon has a speech in print which is said to be five hours long, and almost every Democrat in the Chamber is preparing for his share of the labor.

At 2:25 A. M. the Senate was still in session.

THE HOUSE NIGHT SESSION.

The evening session of the House was given to the Judiciary Committee. Several bills of no public importance were reported and passed, after which Gen. Butler reported his bill providing that all telegraph lines shall be declared post roads, and authorizing the United States to make negotiations for the reception, transmission, and prices of telegraphic messages. Gen. Butler argued that the Government had full authority under the Constitution to regulate the telegraph companies, and that public and private interests required it to be done. He criticised the management of the Western Union Company, and charged that they used telegraphic information of markets from Europe and other places to supply regular customers, and delayed the publication of the intelligence until these customers had an opportunity to operate on the advanced information. He also criticised the management of the Associated Press of New-York, charging that they were partial in making up their general telegraphic news for distribution throughout the country. Mr. Albright related his experiences in Alabama as a member of the Investigating Committee, and said he had abundant evidence of the partisanship of the agents of the Associated Press South in transmitting news for publication. He asserted that even the telegraphic dispatches of the Government were tampered with. Mr. Roberts, of New-York, denied that the Government had any legal right to assume the control and management of the property of telegraph companies, and explained the workings of the Associated Press. Gen. Hawley, of Connecticut, also explained the manner of collecting and distributing news by the telegraph company and the New-York Associated Press. He said the papers in various sections of the country had their own associations, which worked reciprocally with the New-York association. He explained how the news was collected and distributed, and said if it was sometimes colored by prejudice it was owing to the fact that it had been supplied by a local newspaper, which acted as collector, and naturally partook of the prejudice of that paper and locality. Mr. Finck, of Ohio, said the bill was a bold attempt to seize and regulate the telegraph companies without authority of law. Nobody expected that the bill would pass, though a majority voted to second the previous question. The discussion of the bill appears to be a part of a stock-jobbing undertaking, and has its origin in New-York. Without action upon the bill, leaving it to come up to-morrow as unfinished business, the House at 10:35 adjourned.

### *PAYMENT OF THE SECOND LARGEST CLAIM UNDER THE MIXED COMMISSION.*

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—The award in gold coin of over $197,000 made by the late British and American Mixed Commission to Augustus R. McDonald, a citizen of Great Britain, but for some years past a resident of Louisville, Ky., has been paid by our Government to Henry Howard, Esq., agent of the Government of her Britannic Majesty, and by him to Mr. McDonald. This claim was brought for losses sustained in the burning of cotton during the late civil war, and was the second largest claim adjudicated by the late Mixed Commission. An idea of its magnitude may be given by the statement that as originally presented it was for $2,000,000. Five hundred witnesses were examined, and their testimony covers 6,000 printed pages of the record of the commission.

### *THE CANAL BOARD.*

ALBANY, Feb. 17.—At a meeting of the Canal Board to-day Edward Reilly was appointed Inspector for New-York. The following were appointed Superintendents of Canal Repairs: Michael McDonough, West Troy; Benjamin Van Vranken, Schenectady; C. H. Quackenbush, Fultonville; Stephen B. Johnson, Ilion; John Johnson, Utica; Henry Ehle, Chittenango; Abram Scouten, Fayetteville; S. B. Rowe, Camillus; S. D. Streeter, Clyde; James H. Warren, Clarkson; W. McRae, Lockport; John Kelly, Buffalo; John T. Kenyon, Baldwinsville; Frederick Patterson, Constantia; James A. Flanagan, Seneca Falls; D. P. Dey, Watkins; Harmon Bennett, Binghamton; Dennis H. Scanlon, Scottsville, and Samuel F. Garman, Watson. The salary of each of these appointees is $1,500, and each gives a bond in $10,000.

### *ALLEGED RAILROAD MISMANAGEMENT.*

BOSTON, Feb. 17.—An adjourned meeting of the bondholders of the Chicago, Dubuque and Minnesota and the Chicago, Clinton and Dubuque Railroads was held here to-day, to receive and act on the report of the investigating committee appointed two weeks ago. This report alleges gross mismanagement of the roads by the officials, and an alarming lack of responsibility in the expenditure of the funds. Resolutions were adopted requesting the committee to persist in gathering further information, to be submitted to another meeting of the bondholders when completed.

### *DEPOT ROBBED.*

ABINGTON, Penn., Feb. 17.—The North Pennsylvania Railroad Depot was entered last night, the safe in the office blown open, and three money packages, aggregating $165, stolen. No clue to the thieves has been discovered.

### *MARINE DISASTERS.*

NEW-LONDON, Conn., Feb. 17.—Bartlett's Reef light-ship was driven from her moorings to-day by ice. The cutter Samuel Dexter, which is here in consequence of being unable to get through the ice at other ports, was ordered to go after her. She was picked up, however, by the Government steamer Mistletoe, and towed in here. The Stratford light-ship is ashore on Long Island. The propeller E. A. Woodward, of New-York, which had been drifting in the ice in the middle of the Sound several days, sank last night, and the crew has probably perished. The pilot-house and part of the deck were towed in here to-day. New-London harbor has not been closed by the ice this Winter. Vessels enter and depart every day, as in Summer.

### *STRANGE SUICIDE.*

A MAN LEAPS FROM THE DOME OF THE CAPITOL AT WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—About 1:15 o'clock this afternoon an unknown man thirty-five or forty years of age jumped from the second outside gallery of the dome of the Capitol, and struck headforemost on the roof of the main building, a distance of at least 150 feet below. Of course he was killed instantly, his skull being terribly fractured. He leaped out so far as to almost clear the pediment of the central portico. One of the Capitol policemen recognizes him as a poorly dressed white man who had been seen about the building several days recently, and who looked as if he was not altogether of sound mind. The matter created a great deal of excitement in the Capitol. The terrific leap was witnessed by a number of people who were looking out of various windows commanding a view of the front part of the centre building. The body was plainly visible on the roof during the time that elapsed before it could be reached.

A coroner's inquest was held late this afternoon, and the jurors found that the deceased was James MacMahon, of this city, aged twenty-five, and that he came to his death by suicide while under temporary derangement of mind. He had been studying at the Baltimore Catholic College for the priesthood, but was advised by his preceptors to return home. Latterly he had been working at the carpenter's trade with his brothers, and left his residence to-day apparently in good health. The father, who was before the jury, was unable to account for his son's conduct.

### *CONNECTICUT VALLEY AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTE.*

SPRINGFIELD, Mass., Feb. 17.—The Connecticut Valley Agricultural Institute, comprising farmers of the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New-Hampshire, and Vermont, was organized at East Hampton to-day, with E. H. Hyde, of Stafford, Conn., as President, and L. F. Mullen, of West Springfield, Secretary. The institute will probably meet monthly at various points in the valley, and will be addressed principally by officers of agricultural colleges, the object being the spread of scientific knowledge among farmers.

### *FRESHET IN LOUISIANA.*

LAKE CHARLES, La., Feb. 17.—There have been heavy rains in this section during the past few days. The Calcasieu River is very high and is still rising. Several large booms of timber have broken loose, and 4,000 logs have gone adrift. The overland mail is water-bound.

### *TRIAL OF AMBROSE WILLIAMS.*

BOSTON, Mass., Feb. 17.—In the Superior Court at Cambridge, to-day, the trial was begun of the negro Ambrose Williams, for a revolting crime attempted, some weeks since, upon the daughter of Judge Lowell.

### *THE GOOD OLD TIMES AND THE NEW.*

The Springfield (Mass.) *Republican* says that Mr. Samuel Lawrence, founder of the City of Lawrence, but now of Stockbridge, entertained the Lee Literary Club, Monday evening, with an hour's familiar talk, contrasting old times with the present. Glancing rapidly over the character and history of the early colonial settlers, he dwelt particularly on the circumstances and customs of the period just succeeding the revolutionary war, when not a pound of cotton had been raised in this country, not a car-load of coal exhumed from the mines, not a steam-ship traversed our waters, nor any great water-power occupied. The fabrics of the country were mostly spun and wove in families, each farmer raising flax and wool, the mother of the family generally spinning the former on the little wheel, while the daughter walked backward and forward by the side of the big wheel, singing hymns or repeating poetry. Each farm establishment had a loom, which, in some instances, was kept running the year round to supply bed and personal clothing, stacks of the former being piled up for the wedding days of the daughters. Oxen were used for all farm work and horses mainly for riding horseback, the women either riding singly on side-saddle or on pillions behind their husbands, brothers, and sweethearts. Scarcely a light carriage was to be found in the country. Often a hundred women came to one church on horseback. The little cotton cloth used in the country was the "humdrum" from India, made of short staple, costly and poor. Money was comparatively scarce. The salary of the President of Harvard University, after the institution had been in successful operation for over 100 years, was £100 New-England currency, or $333⅓, and this commanded the services of the best scholars of Oxford and Cambridge. The increase in the valuation of the country and the increase of the expenses of living were alike astonishing. Mr. Lawrence, after an experience of more than three-score and ten years, gives his decided preference for modern times. The comforts of life are fourfold more than they used to be, and there is less of intemperance, profanity, and kindred vices.

### *AN ACCUSED MURDERER ACQUITTED.*

The trial of Edward J. Muybridge for the murder of Major Harry Larkyns, the alleged seducer of his wife, was concluded at Napa, Cal., on the 5th inst. by his acquittal, the jury having been out twelve hours. They are said to have stood on the first ballot five for conviction of murder in the first degree and seven for acquittal. Muybridge is about fifty years of age and a photographer by trade. His victim was about thirty-five years old, of English birth, who, after varied experiences, embracing service in the English and French armies, reached California. The act of homicide was deliberate. Muybridge having started from San Francisco with the avowed purpose of killing him. The deed was done at the Yellow Jacket Mine. Muybridge called at a house where Larkyns was playing cards with a party of ladies, in the evening, and when he stepped to the door and asked who was there, the darkness preventing recognition, simply said, "I am Muybridge, and I bring you this message from my wife," and at the same instant fired. Larkyns died in about fifteen minutes. The San Francisco *Chronicle* correspondent says: "On retiring to their room, the jury were given four forms of verdict by the Judge, with instructions to sign the one upon which they agreed, and return with it to court. One was guilty of murder in the first degree and assessing the death penalty, another fixing it as imprisonment for life, a third of not guilty, and the last not guilty because of the defendant's insanity. They were very pointedly instructed by the Judge that if the deceased seduced defendant's wife that constituted no justification for the homicide—that defendant in that case was not justified in taking the law into his own hands and slaying the seducer. The defense, recognizing this as good law, set up the theory that defendant was acting under an irresistible passion or insane impulse arising from the discovery of his wife's infidelity. The jury discarded entirely the theory of insanity, and meeting the case on the bare issue left, acquitted the defendant on the ground that he was justified in killing Larkyns for seducing his wife. Muybridge still denies the correctness of the insanity theory as he did before the trial, saying that he knew what he was doing when he sought Larkyns and killed him, and he did it designedly."

### *BOUNTIES GIVEN AND DESERVED.*

The Toronto *Globe* of Tuesday says: "We understand that the sum of £3 sterling, being the usual grant by her Majesty the Queen to those mothers in her dominions who have been confined of three living children, has been received by the Hon. the Provincial Secretary, for Mrs. Mary Gervais, the wife of Mr. A. Gervais, of the township of Russell, in the county of Russell, in this Province, and will be forwarded to her immediately. It may be interesting to observe that this happy couple have been married a little over two years, and have five children—all boys—twins and triplets. As the parents are in poor circumstances, the Queen's bounty will prove especially welcome at this inclement season of the year."

An opportunity for an enlarged bounty by some American sovereign is afforded by this incident, which is related in the Baltimore *Sun* of Wednesday: "Mrs. Hoen, living at No. 119 Low street, last night gave birth to four female children, all of them fine, healthy babies. The mother is doing as well as could be expected under the circumstances. Dr. Dausch, the family physician, deeming the case one in which he needed assistance, called the services of Dr. Mansfield to his aid. The father, who is quite a small man, was greatly elated when made aware of the number of new arrivals in his family, and treated the physicians to cigars and a hearty shake of the hand."

## LATEST NEWS BY CABLE.

*GREAT BRITAIN.*

JOHN MITCHEL'S PROBABLE POLICY IN PARLIAMENT—THE TIPPERARY ELECTIONS.

LONDON, Feb. 17.—It is reported that John Mitchel will refuse to take the oath of allegiance. It is also said that the other Home Rule members of Parliament will refuse to support Mr. Mitchel, because the policy he proposes to pursue is different from theirs.

At a meeting of electors of the County Tipperary, Ireland, a resolution was adopted declaring that in the event of Mr. Mitchel's election to Parliament being annulled, they would again return him.

ARRIVAL OF THE CAPTAIN AND CREW OF THE SYDNEY DACRES.

LON

# THE NEBRASKA SUFFERERS.

*EXAGGERATED STATEMENTS IN REGARD TO DESTITUTION.*

HOW AND WHY THE FRAUD WAS PERPETRATED ON THE EASTERN PUBLIC—THE PEOPLE OF THE "DEVASTATED COUNTIES" NEVER SO WELL OFF IN THEIR LIVES—MERCHANTS IN THE "STRICKEN DISTRICT" DOING A LARGER BUSINESS THAN EVER—SUPPOSED "SUFFERERS" MORE COMFORTABLE THAN THE DONORS—A WORD OF CAUTION.

*From an Occasional Correspondent.*

OMAHA, Neb., Wednesday, Feb. 10, 1875.

Your correspondent presumes that you would desire to be placed in possession of the facts in regard to the "tempest in a teapot" which has been raised about the grasshopper sufferers in Nebraska. I will not occupy your time with any detailed account of the ferocious grasshopper, as he makes his annual visit to these Western States. It will be sufficient here to state that the insect did make its appearance in unusual quantity last year, and that a great havoc was made with the crops. This is one of the scourges which is expected, and which those who migrate to this country for agricultural purposes take their chances on. It so happened, however, that last year the grasshopper plague could be turned to advantage by the politicians. An election for United States Senator was to come off, and there was no lack of patriotic gentlemen who craved the position, and he, among the anxious, who could command the greatest pressure from the people upon the Legislature, would undoubtedly stand a good chance to step into Mr. Tipton's shoes.

THE HISTORY OF A MILITARY GENTLEMAN.

Now it so happened that among the *military* gentlemen here there was one who had, in *ante bellum*, edited a small newspaper in one of the country towns of Pennsylvania, and who was indebted for his commission to some real or imaginary political service. He is simply a small politician, but he has—without much education—a good knowledge of all the tricks of his trade, and he appeared to have a great influence with the General commanding the Military Department of the Platte. He could by no possibility ever learn anything of his profession as a soldier, but his position was too good to abandon until something better should turn up. He had an inordinate itching for political position, and he would fly upon the wings of the morning—and the grasshoppers—to the United States Senate.

HOW THE HUMBUG WAS WORKED.

It was an easy matter to talk the leading men at Omaha into the belief that there never was such devastation and suffering in Nebraska before, and that the Government, and particularly the army, should do something to relieve the people. It was not difficult to get up meetings and to form committees, at the head of one of which was to be the amiable, but, to say the least, rather eccentric commanding General. Now was the work fairly commenced. The warrior and philanthropist, Brisbin, was to be ordered to perform the military duty of proceeding to Chicago, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Pittsburg, New-York, and to the uttermost parts of the East, and proclaim the woes and sufferings of the people of Nebraska, and to collect money and other trifles. The newspapers throughout the country have told the rest. Large amounts of money and supplies were collected. Our generous people at the East can easily be humbugged, and in this particular case they were much more effectually deluded than were the good people of Nebraska.

The papers had been full of the noble devotion of our warrior politician. In Omaha the papers contained daily puffs of his noble works, for he had taken care to secure the good will, or apparent good will, of the city editors, who, before they were aware of it, were fully compromised in the scheme.

INJURY DONE TO THE STATE.

Soon, however, some people began to see through the flimsy artifice, and to recognize that, by the course pursued, the State was being terribly—perhaps irretrievably—injured. Nebraska was the land cursed by the Almighty—made a waste desert, to which no intelligent emigrants could ever be expected to come. In fact, a pleasant and prosperous State was to be ruined to make a little capital for political tricksters, and to get a little money from the United States Treasury.

THE NEWSPAPERS READY TO DENOUNCE THE SCHEME.

One of the Omaha papers, the *Bee*, made a feeble resistance, and before the Brisbin crusade at the East was half over I think that all of the respectable newspapers of the State would have been glad to denounce the whole scheme. Well, the election for Senator came off. The newspaper puffs, and the touching letters of the warrior candidate, which stated that he had sent "$1 25 to Mrs. Martha Duncan, of Harlan County, Neb., who has a little baby and no milk for it," were duly circulated, and everything appeared to work well. The "General," whose military duty appears to consist in traveling about the country, put in his appearance at the State capital, putting on his most approved democratic airs. But, alas, he did not receive a single vote. I notice, by a newspaper article, that "Gen. Brisbin has again gone East to make collections for the grasshopper sufferers." Prudent people will do well to investigate this matter before a further opening of their purse-strings.

THE TRUE STATE OF THE CASE.

Your correspondent does not desire to call in question the acts of really benevolent persons here or at the East, but it is perfectly evident to every intelligent and thinking person that this "Nebraska Relief Fund" is a great misfortune to the State. I will inclose an editorial from the Omaha *Herald*, of the 6th inst., which will throw more light on the subject than I can give. The *Herald* is one of the leading papers in the State, and ably edited. It published the puffs of Brisbin for weeks, and foolishly went into the great fraud without proper reflection. You will perceive what the editor now thinks of the whole procedure:

That there has been some real suffering in the grasshopper district of this State we do not doubt, and it is probable that a few would go hungry if not fed by charitable people, but we have evidence that the destitution there has been fearfully exaggerated. One man in real danger of starvation has been made to stand for a host, like the soldiers in *Falstaff's* grand army. And that one man, who was really pinched by want in the the early part of the Winter has since spent a more comfortable Winter than he has known since he has been on the frontier. We talked yesterday with a gentleman well known to us as a careful observer, who has just returned from the stricken district. He passed through several counties, stopped to partake of the hospitality of the people, and he knows their circumstances. He went as far west as Buffalo County, and was able to see or hear of anybody in distress. Many were getting along much better than they would have done had there been no grasshoppers. Hall and Buffalo Counties had good crops of oats, wheat, and barley, and a very fine crop of potatoes. The vines were eaten away by the grasshoppers, but they grew again, and produced well, both as to quality and quantity of the yield. *The merchants in the stricken district are doing a better trade than they have ever done at this season of the year.* One of these merchants had a homesteader at work for him for $1 per day, but when the relief supplies began to arrive he quit at once and has not since returned. It is known, also, that men who have 300, 400, and 500 bushels of wheat will apply for their portion of the relief that is to be furnished gratuitously. Their doctrine is, and they take little pains to conceal it, that they might as well have it as anybody. Not long ago a gentleman who owns land in one of the "stricken" counties, sent out to a resident to buy for him a certain quantity of county warrants. The agent wrote back that warrants could be had in former years for sixty-five cents, but the relief fund had made the people so independent that it was difficult to touch them at any price—certainly not less than ninety cents. A gentleman who lives in one of the grasshopper counties has lately said that facts had come within his knowledge showing that *aid had been contributed by people in humble circumstances in the East for relief of supposed sufferers who were more comfortable than the donors.* These circumstances, taken in connection with the further fact that up to the 15th of January more coal had been sent into the grasshopper district and given away than was shipped over the railroads to those counties in all of last year, when the people paid for their coal, show pretty clearly how this matter stands. We hope nobody will be influenced by this view of the situation to withhold aid from the really needy; but truth is healthful and justice wrongs no one.

SUPPLIES DISTRIBUTED TO PEOPLE WHO ARE BETTER OFF THAN THE DONORS.

A half a score of army Lieutenants are at this time scattered around in different parts of the State, by the orders of the commanding General, distributing clothing and supplies to people who are probably as well if not better off than they ever were before in their lives. A story is told of one man who appeared at one of the towns on the railroad with a two-horse wagon to demand a contribution of a load of flour. He confessed that he had never been so well off before, but "as long as the provisions is goin' I want my sheer," said he. In some localities it is doubtful whether the people will put in any crops this year, as they say that there is no use planting for the hoppers, and that enough has been given them to last them through the year.

INQUIRE BEFORE YOU GIVE.

Had the real facts in this matter been made known, the appropriation of money from the United States Treasury would never for one moment have been seriously considered, and if any such money has been appropriated, the sober, serious, thinking people of the State would much prefer to see it recovered into the United States Treasury, the sayings of Senator Hitchcock and other politicians of smaller grade to the contrary notwithstanding.

## *THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.*

FURTHER DISCUSSION ON GERMAN IN THE SCHOOLS—REPETITION OF FORMER ARGUMENTS—A PETITION FROM GERMAN HOUSEHOLDERS.

The Board of Education met yesterday at the corner of Grand and Elm streets, William H. Neilson, President, in the Chair. There was a full attendance. A petition from the German householders of New-York, was presented by Mr. Traud, representing the necessity of continuing the teaching of the German language in the public schools, and deprecating the attempts recently made to exclude it. The memorial closed with a series of resolutions demanding as a right, that in the interests of progress, education, and patriotism, the public schools should furnish ample opportunities for instruction in the German language. Mr. Traud urged in support of the petition that the German language was spoken by one-fifth of the population of this country, and could not be regarded as a foreign tongue. Of all other countries, the English and German nations were nearest to each other in sympathy and aspiration, and he trusted that instruction in the German language would not be excluded from the public school system. The subject was referred to the Committee on Course of Studies.

Commissioner Baker offered a resolution recommending the introduction of a regular course of instruction in needle-work into the public schools, which was adopted.

The discussion on the report of the Committee on Course of Study, which was postponed at the last meeting, was then taken up.

Commissioner Herring referred to that portion of the report in which it was provided that the members of the grammar schools were directed and admonished that all the various provisions of the by-laws relating to the course of instruction, including the teaching of German wherever it had been introduced, should be strictly complied with. Why, he would ask, were the words "direct" and "admonish" inserted? Were not the by-laws of the board sufficiently imperative? He took exception to the language of the resolution, in which he found the most important reason why it should not be adopted. It had been said that the report merely reaffirmed the by-laws and regulations of the board, but behind the language made use of he could perceive the insidious steps of those who would be reformers. Like the Spartan boy who told his mother his sword was too short and who was advised to advance a step, the Germans were advancing step by step upon the public-school system. He therefore requested that the report should be recommitted to the Committee of Studies of which he was Chairman, and he would offer a substitute which would place the German language where it belonged, and would be doing justice to the English-speaking children in the schools.

The substitute recommended that teachers of vocal music, drawing, French, and German should be classed as special teachers, whose salaries should not exceed $90 a year for each hour employed in any school, nor $900 a year for any particular school; and also that at least fifty pupils attending a grammar department in the first, second, and third grades should desire the introduction of German or French before these classes should be established, and that in no instance should these branches be taught contrary to the wishes of the parents or guardians of the pupils.

Commissioner Man hoped that before the report was recommitted the German members would have an opportunity of expressing their views on the subject.

Commissioner Herring withdrew his substitute to allow the question to be discussed.

Commissioner Klamroth then said that Mr. Herring stated that the demand of the German tax-payers was preposterous, because they received the full value of the money they contributed to the school fund, but he did not think they were asking too much when they desired to have their children instructed in their own tongue. He proceeded at much length in reply to the arguments advanced by Commissioner Herring at the last meeting against the adoption of the report, and called in question the statistics presented by him as to the distribution of time for the various classes. Commissioner Herring inquired if Mr. Klamroth had obtained his statistics from actual observation, to which he replied in the negative, and then proceeded to deal with the objections urged by Mr. West and Mr. Baker. He also read a passage from an article in yesterday's TIMES, to which he said he was ready to reply. He did not consider instruction in the German language essential to common school education under ordinary circumstances, but there were circumstances which should change people's views in the matter. It became their duty to bind the German children to the common school system in order to Americanize them. In this City we were not placed in ordinary circumstances, as they prevailed in small cities or the country, and we should accommodate ourselves to the circumstances in which we were placed. If at an expenditure of $45,000 20,000 German children could be retained in the public schools, it was their duty to expend that sum for the purpose. Referring to the remarks of Commissioner Herring to the effect that German calligraphy was injurious to the sight, he said that the Germans were not half so blind as he took them to be.

Commissioner Baker delivered a lengthy address, in the course of which he said his opposition to the adoption of the report was based solely upon considerations of justice, and not from any partisan bias, and after some further discussion upon the question, the whole subject was referred to the Committee on Course of Studies.

The annual report was presented by the Finance Committee, and was ordered to be printed, and the meeting was then adjourned.

## *REFORM OF THE LAWS OF NATIONS.*

THE APPROACHING MEETING IN SEPTEMBER—OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY AND THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE.

The members of the Executive Committee of the International Code Committee of America are now actively at work, in connection with the Association for the Reform and Codification of the Laws of Nations, of which the Code Committee is a branch, in making preparations for the next general meeting, which will be held in either Brussels or The Hague. They propose to have a council meeting within a short period, and simultaneous with a like meeting of the English Council in London. The next general meeting will be held in the latter part of September, or early in October, of this year. The place of meeting has not yet been determined on, but it is probable that either Brussels or The Hague will be the place selected. The American Committee are making strong efforts to induce the association to have the meeting of 1876 held in Philadelphia or New-York, during the Centennial, and it is hoped that their efforts in that direction will be crowned with success. The following is a list of officers of the parent association and the Executive Committee of the American branch:

*Honorary President.*—Count Frederick Sclopis, Turin.
*President.*—David Dudley Field, New-York.
*Vice Presidents.*—Austria—Baron Von Kubeck, Vienna; Dr. Neumann, Vienna. Belgium—Charles Faider, Counselor of State, Brussels; Aug. Couvreur, Rédacteur de l'*Independance Belge*. England—Right Hon. Mountague Bernard, Ross, Hereford; Sir Travers Twiss, Q. C. France—M. Brouyn De L'Huys, Paris; M. Eugéne Cauchy, Paris. Germany—Baron Von Holtzendorff, Munich; Dr. Bluntschli, Heidelberg. Holland—Ph. J. Bachiene, Counselor of State, Hague; Fredius, Amsterdam. Italy—Pasquale P. S. Mancini, Rome; Prof. Aug. Pierantoni, Naples. Russia—Prof. T. M. C. Besobrazoff, University of St. Petersburg; Dr. Martens, St. Petersburg. Spain—Senor Don Emilio Castelar, Madrid; Sigismond Moret y Prendegast, Madrid. Switzerland—Prof. Charles G. Konnig, Berne; Prof. Charles Brocher, Geneva. Sweden—Dr. Hedlund, Gottenburg; Dr. Jonas Jonason, Gottenburg. United States—Charles Francis Adams, Boston; Reverdy Johnson, Baltimore.
*Council.*—England—Sheldon Amos, Joseph Brown, H. D. Jencken, J. Hinde Palmer, Henry Richard, Thomas Webster, Joshua Williams. France—Frederic Passy, United States of America—Theodore D. Woolsey, David Dudley Field, Emory Washburn, Charles A. Peabody, Joseph P. Thompson, James B. Miles.
*Treasurer.*—Isidor Geratenberg, London.
*General Secretary.*—James B. Miles, Boston.
*International Secretaries.*—Henry D. Jencken, Barrister-at-Law, London; Frederic Passy, Société des Economistes, Paris.

The Executive Committee of the American branch are: Hon. David Dudley Field, Chairman; President Barnard, of Columbia College; Chancellor Pruyn, of Albany; Judge Peabody, Elihu Burritt, William E. Dodge; President Woolsey, of Yale College; ex-Gov. Emory Washburn, of Massachusetts, and Edward S. Tobey. Mr. J. B. Miles, of Boston, is their Secretary.

## *A REMARKABLE VALENTINE.*

A young lady in Troy, says the *Press* of that city, received on Saturday, by express, a box in which she found a beef's heart pierced with a golden arrow of elegant manufacture, set with jewels, and estimated to be worth seventy-five dollars. It is probably intended to be used either as a neck pin or as an ornament for the hair. There was no intimation who is the giver, nor can the lady or her family imagine who sent it. For the donor of so expensive a gift he shows a strange taste in sending such a remarkable valentine to a lady. A pet dog had the heart for his dinner.

# FORTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

*SECOND SESSION....Feb. 17.*

## SENATE.

THE PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SPRAGUE, of Rhode Island, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported back the Pension Appropriation bill, and it was placed on the calendar.

THE SITE FOR THE PEABODY SCHOOL, IN FLORIDA.

Mr. HOWE, of Wisconsin, called up his motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill to grant a site for the Peabody School, in St. Augustine, Fla., was passed.

Mr. BOUTWELL said he was opposed to the policy of granting a lot here and a lot there for school purposes. There should be some general plan in regard to educational aid. Another reason why he opposed the bill was, that it excluded colored children from the school.

The vote by which the bill was passed was reconsidered—yeas 31, nays 25—Messrs. Boreman, Gilbert, Lewis, Morrill of Vermont, Sargent, Sherman, Sprague, and Tipton, voting with the Democrats against the reconsideration.

THE POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WEST, of Louisiana, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported back the Post Office Appropriation bill with sundry amendments, and it was placed on the calendar.

THE LOUISIANA SENATORSHIP.

The morning hour having expired the Senate resumed consideration of the resolution for the admission of Mr. Pinchback as Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MORTON, of Indiana, said he would request the Senate to stay here without adjournment until this question was disposed of.

Mr. FERRY, of Connecticut, hoped the appeal made by the Senator from Indiana would not be regarded by the Senate. To ask Senators opposed to this resolution to stay here and make speeches to empty seats during the night upon a question of so much importance was monstrous.

Mr. SARGENT then concluded his argument. He referred to the condition of Arkansas, and claimed that its Government was illegally subverted. He said the number of murders committed there for political purposes was very large. He read from a correspondence in THE NEW YORK TIMES, giving a deplorable condition of things in Alabama, and said we are grappling with a barbarism that will make the negro a savage and the South a desert. He expressed his determination to stand by the President and enforce just and humane laws in the South.

Ident in his efforts to restrain revolutionary disorders.

Mr. FERRY, of Connecticut, addressed the Senate. The following are the chief points in his arguments: What is the controversy? On the 4th of March, 1873, a vacancy occurred in this body which should have been filled by the election of a Senator from the State of Louisiana. Two gentlemen presented certificates of election—Mr. McMillan and Mr. Pinchback—both in due form and signed in each case by a person designated as Secretary of State on one of these certificates were different from the persons so designated on the other. Both certificates of election were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Both are now before the Senate, and every word that the Senator from Indiana uttered the other day, and every precedent that he cited, and all the debates of past years that he caused to be read apply with exactly the same force to the certificate of election of Mr. McMillan as to the certificate of Mr. Pinchback. How is it, then, that this committee presents itself before the Senate with a declaration that Mr. Pinchback is *prima facie* entitled to the seat without a pretense of having gone outside of the certificates of election, and even denying the right to go behind them? Why not choose Mr. McMillan's certificate instead of Pinchback's? We are in this case compelled to go behind the certificates of election. Who was the Governor and who was the Secretary of State of Louisiana in 1873 when these certificates bear date? These certificates do not tell us, and we cannot decide until we have ascertained which of the persons executing them possessed the authority to execute them under the Constitution and laws of the United States. We have no further to go than to the great volume of 400 or 500 pages of testimony before our own committee, now lying upon our tables, and unfolding unto us the whole sickening history from its beginning to its end. What, then, are the facts? Was William Pitt Kellogg elected Governor of Louisiana in the Autumn of 1872? No, Sir; the evidence in that volume demonstrates that of the votes cast, he did not receive a majority, and the committee expressly find the fact. The Senator from Wisconsin, [Mr. Carpenter,] the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. Logan,] the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. Alcorn,] and the Senator from Rhode Island, [Mr. Anthony,] append their names to the finding of the fact, that in that election Mr. Kellogg was defeated. Were any returns canvassed by which he was returned as elected? None whatever. The pretended canvass by his Returning Board is delineated in the report of that committee in stronger language than I should care to use here. Was there any lawful Returning Board, or Board of Canvassers, that made such return? None. So that there is not, upon the actual facts existing, even the color of a title of an election of the person whose name is signed to the certificate of election reported by the committee to the Governor of Louisiana. How, then, came he to assume to place his name to this certificate? Again the record unfolds the facts. There was an election in that State. The majority of the votes were against him. They may have been procured by intimidation, or force, or fraud. We now only are to ascertain the fact whether he did receive a majority of the votes or not; and the report of your committee and the evidence demonstrates that he did not. A body of men without authority, without legal existence as a Returning Board, by fraud, by falsehood, by forgery, by perjury, made out a return which was sent to another body designating himself as Governor of Louisiana; each countersigned by a person designating himself as Secretary of the State of Louisiana; each authenticated by the Great Seal of the State. But the person designated as Governor and the person designated as a legislature, and that return, founded solely upon the infamies which I have described, is said by your committee, and proved by the evidence, to be the only color of title upon which Mr. Kellogg assumes this authority. Now, if these things are true, the placing of his name to this paper styled a certificate of election, adds not one whit of virtue to what that paper had when it was a white blank sheet.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky, spoke in opposition to the resolution, and at some length from the testimony taken by the committee of the Senate in 1873. While commenting upon the action of Durell and the telegram of Attorney General Williams, Mr. Stevenson, turning toward Mr. West, said: The Senator from Louisiana smiles. So did Nero smile when Rome was burning. He [Mr. Stevenson] never knew a guilty criminal, or one where the truth was brought home to him, that he did not flinch.

Mr. WEST said he smiled at the Senator's [Mr. Stevenson's] ignorance. He then stated that on the 16th November the Governor of Louisiana [Warmoth] had disregarded an order of the United States Court, and it was for this reason that the Attorney General had sent that dispatch to Marshal Packard to enforce the decrees of the United States Court. The Senator [Mr. Stevenson] must not say that he [Mr. West] stood here to defend criminals.

Mr. STEVENSON said he did not say the Senator stood here to defend criminals, but he would say now, if he defended Packard, Casey, and Durell, he did defend criminals. [Loud applause in the galleries and laughter on the floor.]

Mr. HOWE, of Wisconsin, obtained the floor, and yielded to Mr. Morton, who moved that the Senate take a recess till 7:30 o'clock P. M.

Mr. HAMILTON, of Maryland, moved to adjourn. Lost—yeas, 22; nays, 33.

The motion of Mr. Morton for a recess was agreed to—yeas, 38; nays, 12—and the Senate at 5:30 took a recess till 7:30 P. M.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THE REVENUE BILL.

Mr. DAWES, of Massachusetts, moved to limit general debate on the Tariff bill to three and a quarter hours. Agreed to—82 to 65.

Mr. DAWES moved to go into Committee of the Whole on the Tariff bill. Agreed to—90 to 65.

The House thereupon went into Committee of the Whole (Mr. Hale, of Maine, in the Chair) on the Tariff bill.

Mr. BURCHARD, of Illinois, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, said that for some years past the pleasant duty presented to members of Congress had been that of reducing taxation. But now, for the first time since the war, the Committee on Ways and Means proposed to increase taxation. The question that at once occurred was, whether there was any necessity for raising more revenue. He proceeded to argue that there would not be, if the Government were to follow the example of the people and practice economy in its expenditures; but he figured it out that after providing for the expenditures and for the sinking fund, there would be twenty millions of a deficit. From what sources could that twenty millions be collected? The tax on tea and coffee had been suggested, and he for one had no objection to see that tax reimposed, because it was pure revenue, was equally diffused, and every dollar collected under it went into the Treasury. He had no objection, however, to the proposed increased tax on whisky and tobacco, and he estimated that the increased tax would produce about $30,000,000. He did, however, object to the restoration of the ten per cent. reduction on certain manufactured goods, and argued that that restoration would disturb all the interests of the country, while it would only produce $6,000,000.

Mr. CHITTENDEN, of New-York, also opposed the bill.

Mr. COX, of New-York, also opposed the bill, and in the course of his speech said: The announcement of this bill, like the menace against Louisiana and Arkansas, comes to us in the unredressed and helpless condition which I have depicted. The channels of trade are still. The wheels of industry are cut down and their purchasing power diminished. Transportation is to some extent and at this season closed and its cost enhanced, while the industry and production of the country, half dead, is languishing into complete prostration. If this bill is anywise in the interest of protection, so called, and not of revenue, properly considered; if it is in the line of grabbing monopoly and selfish precedents; if it raises less revenue than other plans, while it taxes more the labor of the masses; if it re-enacts old swindles or propounds new ones; in fine, if there be other and better modes of sustaining the Government which a vigilant committee could ascertain, but fail to adopt or present, then let us assume the responsibility, and vote against the measure. The capital question to be asked when such bills appear is, Have we first endeavored by all means to economize? A household which is living on its capital, and beyond its income, must retrench or go into smaller quarters, or sell out. Where is there any evidence here of reform in this regard? Why must we tax thirty or forty millions more as absolutely necessary, when millions on the Navy buildings, rivers, Indians, Army, &c., can be saved without detriment to the public?

Mr. NIBLACK, of Indiana, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, also opposed the bill because he was not convinced that there was any absolute necessity for increased taxation at this time.

Mr. BECK, of Kentucky, (another member of the Committee on Ways and Means,) also opposed the bill. He contended that no additional revenue was required. Talking of the question of the sinking fund, he argued that the reduction of the public debt to a much larger amount than was required for the sinking fund was a virtual compliance with the law. No bond-holders had complained of it, nor would they have been justified in complaining of it. They had bought their bonds with greenbacks and the principal of the bonds had been payable in greenbacks until by the law of 1869, the worst and most infamous law ever passed, the principal was made payable in gold, thus putting into the pockets of the bondholders untold millions at the cost of the taxpayers. These were the men who had got the gold and if any wrong had been done they were the beneficiaries.

Mr. WARD, of Illinois, protested against some of the provisions of the bill. He had not studied the subject sufficiently to determine whether any additional revenue was required, but he thought that the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means had no right to complain if the House took him at his word of last year, when he told the House that the revenue was sufficient. He was satisfied, however, that the bill was unjust from beginning to end, and was such a compromise as to be unworthy of consideration.

Mr. WHITEHEAD, of Virginia opposed the bill in the interests of the tobacco producers and manufacturers.

Mr. KASSON, of Iowa, (a member of the Committee on Ways and Means,) remarked that if any member ever had the delusion that the duties of that committee were pleasant, he thought that by this time that delusion must be dispelled; contrasting the English with the American parliamentary system, he said that in England both parties stood by the honor of the country, and he wished to God that here there was some question of personal liberty on one hand, or of financial credit and the honor of the Government on the other, on which members of the House could be united without political division. When the President of the United States, in conformity with his constitutional duty, called the attention of the House to the deficiency in the Treasury, and when the Secretary of the Treasury, in accordance with his duty, called the attention of Congress to the fact that the revenues were not meeting expenditures, and that not a dollar was left to go to the sinking fund, he (Mr. Kasson) had hoped that the voice of party would be silent in the House, and that the voice of honor and patriotism would be heard.

Mr. KINLACK.—Does the Government expect us to vote for a bill that is against all our theories of taxation, and especially when we do not really believe that there is any necessity for increased taxation at all?

Mr. KASSON.—I shall come to that point and see whether it can be maintained that there is no necessity for taxation; but for the present I go on to say that if the facts are as represented by the Government, no man has the moral right to refuse to maintain the honor of the country and to provide for meeting all the liabilities of the Government. Is it the Administration that makes the expenditures? No; the Administration does not pay out a dollar without the consent of Congress. If the rebuke is addressed anywhere, it is addressed to Congress and not to the Executive. Where will you reduce your expenditures? Will you still further express your hostility to your gallant little army? You have struck it so many blows within the last four years that there is not a man of honor North, South, East, or West, who does not feel that you have strained the confidence of that army in the legislative branch of the Government to its utmost limit. For myself, I say that not for one legislative blow against that army can my vote be obtained. The other day a certain portion of this House objected even to giving a little parade music to the West Point Academy, where the military mind is formed and the military spirit is cultivated. I never fet more mortified at a manifestation of petty economy than on that occasion. Will you economize in the Navy? Will you strike at it? Is there any man here who believes that we have one ship too many? Is there a man who will maintain that we should reduce the strength or efficiency of the Navy? That flag which was once carried so proudly by the Navy, and which was once seen in the various ports of the world, is now rarely seen in many of them. No more blows to be struck at the Navy, say I for one. I would rather be taxed on everything I use and own than to strike at these two great arms of the service on which we rely at every peril to maintain the honor and interests of the United States. Then, again, if you maintain that your civil list is too large, I say point out the place and let us reduce it; but do not say in general language that the expenditures are too large, unless at the same time you point to the place where the reduction can be made. I believe that since the reduced expenditures reported by the Committee on Appropriations it will be difficult to get a reduction of even $1,000,000 on the civil list. You have reduced your expenditures on fortifications so low that no member of the House proposed to reduce them. Will you strike at the appropriations for river and harbors? You might strike them to some extent, but not to the extent of even $5,000,000, for the entire bill is only $5,000,000 or $6,000,000. Our rivers must be improved if we have the means to do it, and I affirm for one that we in the West would rather suffer some new taxes than have the improvements of the Mississippi River stopped. Then, unless you can point out where a certain number of millions can be and will be saved, you must admit that there is necessity for more revenue. Will you provide for the deficiency in the revenue, or will you let the obligations of the Government to individuals or to the sinking fund go to protest?

Mr. KASSON then went on to discuss the details of the bill, indicating his distaste for the restoration of the ten per cent. reduction on manufactured goods, but intimating that either that or the restoration of the duty on tea and coffee had to be resorted to. In regard to the increased tax on whisky, he read a dispatch received by him this morning from the distillers of Peoria, Ill., stating they were not particularly opposed to the increase, but did not think it advisable to tax the stock on hand. He concluded by appealing to the House. If those who were opposed to the Administration still insisted on saying that there was a deficiency, or still insisted on leaving the sinking fund unprovided for, then he appealed to the Republican side of the House, and asked them to recollect that on one occasion, in 1868, there was a glow of patriotism among the people when the Chicago Convention declared that the public faith should be maintained, and that the letter and spirit of the bond given to the public creditors required its payment in gold. The people always sustained the honor, the good faith, and the credit of the Government.

The general debate was here closed, and the committee proceeded to consider the bill, under the five-minute rule.

Mr. SOUTHARD, of Ohio, moved to strike out the first section.

Mr. SAYLER, of Ohio, spoke in favor of that motion.

Mr. BANNING, of Ohio, also spoke in the same strain, and Mr. Dawes briefly replied to Mr. Sayler.

Mr. GARFIELD, of Ohio, offered a substitute for the first section, taxing whisky eighty-five cents per gallon, but not taxing stock on hand.

Mr. COX moved to amend the first section by increasing the duty on champagne from $6 per dozen of quarts to $9; and from $3 per dozen of pints to $4 50. He said that that would produce an increase of $676,000 of revenue. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURCHARD, of Illinois, opposed Mr. Garfield's amendment, and argued in favor of a permanent settled tax of $1 a gallon.

Mr. GARFIELD modified his amendment by making the tax $1 a gallon.

Mr. GUNCKEL, of Ohio, moved to amend Mr. Garfield's substitute by providing to tax the stock on hand, which, after debate, was agreed to; and then, as the substitute became substantially the same as the section of the bill reported by the committee, the substitute was rejected, leaving the first section the same as reported, except as it was amended in regard to champagne.

The committee then rose and the House at 4:40 took a recess till 7:30, the evening session to be for business from the Judiciary Committee, excluding political measures.

## *NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.*

REVENUE, NAVAL, AND POSTAL NOMINATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—The President sent the following nominations to the Senate to-day:

Charles F. Swift, to be Collector of Customs at Barnstable, Mass.; Ebenezer T. Fox, to be Collector of Customs at Bangor, Me.; Second Lieut. Charles W. Mason, Thirteenth Infantry, to be Second Lieutenant Fourth Infantry; Joel T. Mason, of Wisconsin, to be Receiver of Public Moneys at Falls of St. Croix, Wis.

Michael Field to be Register of the Land Office at Falls of St. Croix, Wis.

Navy Cadet Engineers Asa Mattice, George B. Ransom, William C. Eaton, Frank J. Hoffman, Alfred B. Canaga, Abraham B. Zane, John R. Edwards, Benjamin H. Warren, Albert Willetts, and Henry Potts, to be Assistant Engineers in the Navy.

*Postmasters*—A. C. Barber, Lambertville, N. J.; George W. Grant, Reading, Penn.; Miss Ada J. Blair, Waterloo, Ind.; John N. Bunyan, Warsaw, Ind.; Mrs. H. L. Austin, Pontiac, Ill.; Frank Jones, Owego, N. Y.; Charles J. Main, Canton, Ill.; Comly Townsend, Salem, Ohio; George W. Destricks, Defiance, Ohio; Samuel B. Hickman, Coffeyville, Kan.; Peter J. Patton, Burlington, Kan.; Augustus B. Farnham, Bangor, Me.

*Revenue Appointments.*—The following appointments of Internal Revenue Storekeepers have been made in the First District of Illinois: Julius Robertson, George R. Dyer, and J. W. Steinmetz. Jasper A. Vaugh is appointed Storekeeper in the Eighth District of Kentucky.

## *A DISHONEST CONDUCTOR.*

As Mrs. Sarah McMann, of No. 6 Beach street, was riding up town on a Second avenue car, on the 3d inst., she dropped her pocket-book, containing $50. John Connor, a passenger, discovered it after she left the car, and handed it to the conductor, William B. Hickox, to be taken to the railway office. The lady soon discovered her loss, and took another car up to the depot, but found that Hickox had not left her pocket-book. Hickox was subsequently identified by O'Connor, and admitted keeping the pocket-book, saying that its contents just got him out of debt. He was committed yesterday, by Justice Smith, at the Tombs Police Court.

# CUBAN AFFAIRS.

*LATEST WAR NEWS FROM THE ISLE.*

OFFICIAL REPORT OF A DESPERATE FIGHT BETWEEN THE INSURGENTS AND SPANIARDS.

HAVANA, Feb. 17.—The *Gaceta* publishes the following official resumé of military operations in the Cinco Villas district for the past fortnight:

On Feb. 6 the insurgents met with a repulse in an attack on Fort Ojo del Agua.

Brig. Gen. Valera attacked and dispersed a party of insurgents who had burned the settlement of Los Chambas. The enemy are reported to have lost 100 men in the fight and pursuit which ensued.

A Spanish column, numbering 365 men, was attacked by 400 insurgents, commanded by Gonzales, near Manacas. The fighting was desperate on both sides. The Spaniards retreated after a loss of 150 killed, wounded, and missing. The loss of the enemy must have been equally heavy.

The insurgents on the 12th set fire to the Santa Rosa and Pelay plantations, but the flames were extinguished by the troops, and the next day a conflagration was prevented at Yaqua, where several buildings had been fired.

The torch was also applied to the Santa Maria and Pedroso plantations, but the insurgents left on the approach of Brig. Gen. Arminan. An engagement followed, in which thirty-nine insurgents were killed. The loss of the Spaniards is not stated. Col. Herrera, with the mobilized volunteers of Colon and Guamutas, had a fight with the insurgents on the Pedroso plantation. He retreated, losing seven killed. The enemy's loss is unknown.

Captain General Concha is still directing the campaign in the Cinco Villas.

The Captain General has ordered a more vigorous enforcement of the censorship. A staff officer under the supervision of the General in charge of the Censor's Office is to carefully examine all news dispatches or newspaper articles that in any way bear upon the war; and any persons publishing such article or dispatch without submitting it to the censorship will be punished to the full extent of the law.

THE CAPTAIN GENERAL'S ASSURANCES—INFLATED REPORTS AND REAL FIGHTS—CONCHA'S RESIGNATION—THE NEW GOVERNOR.

*From Our Own Correspondent.*

HAVANA, Friday, Feb. 12, 1875.

My last letter gave an account of the departure of the Captain General on Sunday last for the field of operations, to assume the task of directing the campaign, and of driving the insurgents from the Cinco Villas. At mid-day he arrived at Union, and there reviewed the battalion of Alacrane's volunteers, stopping only long enough for that purpose, and then keeping on to Colon, where he reviewed the cavalry volunteers of Colon, and the Chapelgorris of Guamutas, as well as the infantry force of the district, which had been drawn up to receive him, and which is the volunteer force he has called out to accompany him in his campaign. His Excellency slept at Colon, and early next morning left for Santo Domingo, breakfasted, and then departed again for Santa Clara, where he arrived Monday afternoon. From Santa Clara he has addressed a telegram to the Colonial Minister, in which he very coolly sought to imply that since his arrival all trouble had ceased, and that the plantations destroyed had been burned before his arrival. His reports to the daily press of the city—or such reports as the press are allowed to publish—state that the burning of the plantations of the Villas has been done by small insurgent parties, some of them not more than half a dozen strong; and that those plantations on which any resistance was made, or on which any disposition for defense was shown, were saved; he represents those totally destroyed as really few in number, the greater part of those which have been fired still continuing the grinding of the crop. It is hoped that very shortly there will not remain in the Western Villas any insurgents but the insignificant bands which have so constantly taken refuge in the Siguanea Ridge, and which will be followed up in due season.

But these indefinite assertions are not enough. It is known, from private letters and other sources, that the insurgents have destroyed numerous small farms, and have ruined completely many sugar plantations on others, burning up the cane-fields, and causing immense losses. There are rumors, not yet officially confirmed, but the truth must leak out some day, of severe encounters between the contending forces. There occurred, it is said, an action at Camarrones, in which the Spanish infantry was protected by a squadron of cavalry. At the first shock the insurgent cavalry under Maximo Gomez dispersed the Spanish cavalry and cut down the infantry without mercy. Report has it that the Spanish loss in this action was 150 killed and a number wounded.

Official reports from Col. Fortun state that the insurgent chief killed in the fight at Cabaiguan was Col. Ultra, a native of Trinidad, and that in the *manigua*, or undergrowth, adjacent to the site of the encounter, seven more of the enemy's dead were discovered. The report from Brigadier Zea to the General commanding, on the same affair, states that Col. Valena's column which passed the night at Los Palmas heard firing toward Chambas, and marched thither at a quick step, only to find the greater part of the town in flames. By marching in the direction taken by the retreating insurgents, they overtook them when about two miles from the town, at the Santa Clara pasture. The Orders Battalion was in the van, and fell at once upon

# MR. BEECHER ON TRIAL.

## TILTON LEAVES THE WITNESS STAND.

HE NEVER TOLD MRS. MORSE ANYTHING WHICH SHE HAD NOT PREVIOUSLY LEARNED FROM MRS. TILTON—OTHER OF MRS. TILTON'S LETTERS—THE RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION—BOWEN'S $7,000 CHECK PRODUCED—IT WAS DRAWN APRIL 4, 1870, INSTEAD OF APRIL 2.

Yesterday's proceedings were marked by the retirement of Tilton from the stand, and the incident of a juror fainting in the jury-box. Mr. and Mrs. Beecher were present during the morning session. Mrs. Tilton, as usual, was accompanied by Mrs. Fields. Judge Moore, of Brooklyn, and Police Justice Sherwood, of New-York, occupied seats on the bench. On Tilton's taking the stand the actual proceedings of the day were begun by Judge Neilson warning the audience with regard to unseemly demonstrations of approval or disapproval, and informing them that he would directly appeal to any gentleman whom he should observe offending in that regard. The witness was then asked whether during his examination before the Church Committee, he said anything regarding the purity of his wife, other than the expressions already testified to as having been made by him. After some objections by Mr. Evarts with a view of definitely fixing the question, the Court allowed it, and Tilton explained some of the peculiar phrases used by him. He was next questioned as to the precise nature of the language used in his interview with Mr. Halliday. He said that he did not tell Mr. Halliday that his wife was as pure as gold, but that he did say to Mr. Halliday, "Go to Mr. Beecher and he will tell you she is as pure as gold." Allusion was then made to Mr. Tilton's previous statement, that during a chance interview with his wife, Bessie Turner heard the whole story. He was asked when that interview took place. Mr. Evarts objected to the question, and a long argument followed. The court admitted the question, and Tilton answered that it was on the day of Mrs. Tilton's return from Marietta, Ohio, either toward the close of November or in the beginning of December, 1870. He was then asked what was the whole story that Bessie Turner so heard. This was at once objected to by Mr. Evarts, and, after some argument by counsel, was ruled out by Judge Neilson. In reply to a question from Judge Fullerton, the witness stated that the suggestion that Mr. Beecher should go see Mrs. Tilton on the night of the interview in Moulton's house originated with Beecher, and that what he said was after Beecher had made the request. He was then asked whether, when he spoke to Mrs. Morse, he supposed she would reveal it, and the witness answered that he had never told her anything which had not previously been told her by Mrs. Tilton, and that he had never spoken to her later than October, 1870.

Tilton then stated that the payment of the $7,000 by Bowen had nothing to do with the signing of the tripartite covenant, and that he considered every cent of the $7,000 legally due him. He was then questioned by Judge Fullerton regarding the Commune, and gave his definition of it as the body of citizens of Paris who desired that the Aldermen of each commune or ward of Paris should be elected by the vote of the people, as in the City of Brooklyn, and not appointed by the Mayor, as in Paris. He asserted that Roussel was not arrested and executed for killing the Archbishop of Paris and the Chief Justice of France, but that he was put to death for a purely military offense. In reference to the Winsted, Conn., scandal, Tilton stated, in reply to questions, that the young lady was a school girl sixteen or seventeen years old, a companion of his daughter Florence, who had been visiting his house, and that Mrs. Tilton suggested that he should take her to Winsted to hear him lecture. He also explained the expression "spendthrift tendencies" as meaning his unnecessary purchases of pictures and ornaments to beautify his house. He also stated that in his interview with Jackson S. Schultz regarding a subscription to the stock of the *Golden Age*, he told Mr. Schultz that he could not put himself under any obligation to Mr. Beecher, but did not explain the reason why. He was then questioned regarding Mrs. Woodhull, and stated that she was an advertised broker, having a public office in Broad street; that she brought him through her unfurnished private residence to convince him that she did not keep a house of ill-fame, and that she always acted like a perfect lady, and her husband like a perfect gentleman. Tilton then stated that Beecher's letter of consolation to Mrs. Tilton, written after the publication of the Woodhull scandal, was written that she might show it to persons making inquiries of her regarding the scandal. Mr. Fullerton proposed to read in evidence two letters written by Mrs. Tilton to her husband, one in 1871 and the other in 1872. The counsel contended that he was entitled to read them in order to remove the impression made by the reading of the Catherine Gaunt letter, as those letters contained sentiments diametrically opposite to those expressed in that letter. Mr. Evarts opposed the introduction of the letters in a long argument. The court decided to admit the letter written in 1871 and ruled out the letter written in 1872. The first letter on being read was found to contain the following passage:

> Oh, my dear husband, may you not need the further discipline of being misled by a good woman as I have been by a good man.
>
> I rejoice in your happy face and peaceful mind, though I am not in anywise the cause. It will be God's gift alone if your face illumines or heart throbs with thoughts of me."

This closed the re-direct examination of the witness.

His re-cross-examination was then begun by Mr. Evarts. Tilton's ideas of liberality in the law regarding marriage and divorce were searchingly inquired into. Mr. Evarts referred to a private letter he held in his hand, and questioned Tilton whether, in a lecture delivered by him at Northfield, Minn., he had expressed certain loose ideas regarding marriage. Tilton denied having done so. The check for $7,000 with which Bowen paid the amount of the arbitrated debt was produced by Mr. Evarts and identified by Tilton. It appeared from it that the check was drawn on April 4, instead of April 2, as previously testified to. Tilton was then cross-examined as to the finding of the photographs of Beecher in the closet. He denied having given any of them to his wife, or of his having seen them or the books given her by Beecher up to the time he found them in the closet. After the reading of two of Mrs. Tilton's letters, Mr. Evarts announced that the re-cross examination of Tilton had closed.

Just at this moment a sudden commotion in the jury-box attracted the attention of the court, and it was seen that one of the jurors, Mr. Davis, overcome by the foul air of the court-room, had fainted away. The court was at once adjourned, and Mr. Davis was carried into the Judge's room, where he received medical attendance, and in a short time recovered sufficiently to go home. It was suggested by several members of the jury that during the recess all the windows of the court-room should be opened to their widest extent, so as to allow the foul air generated during the morning session to be replaced by pure air.

### THE PROCEEDINGS.

At the opening of the court the jury was called, and having answered to their names Mr. Tilton resumed his seat on the stand. Mr. Fullerton rose with the view of continuing the re-direct cross-examination, when the court interrupted, saying: **Wait a moment Mr. Fullerton, I want to speak to the audience.** The experience of yesterday makes it necessary that I **should ask the audience to be more quiet hereafter. I think the witnesses ought to be called here and examined without any gentleman present testifying what they think of it—without gentlemen turning to those that sit near them and making remarks about them, and making faces either by way of approbation or disapprobation. And the significance of this you might well understand if you read what *Hamlet* says about silent protests and silent expressions of opinion, or recall the effect of pantomimes, which is a very powerful mode, a very eloquent mode of expressing opinion. As a matter of decency and respect to the court, and respect to the oath of the witnesses, I must ask that this be discontinued, and I shall make direct personal appeal to any gentleman that I see hereafter offending against this rule.**

The re-direct examination of Mr. Tilton was then continued:

THE RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED.

Q.—Now, Mr. Tilton, when you were before that committee did you say anything else in reference to the purity of your wife in answer to questions put to you at that time; you may look at that (book handed witness) and see if it refreshes your recollection?

Mr. Evarts—Before answering Mr. Fullerton let me see it.

Witness—Which part do you desire me to look at?

Mr. Fullerton—That part in red there, in ruby.

Witness (after reading)—Well, Sir, the part to which you call my attention, marked in red, is very badly bungled in its expression.

Mr. Evarts—Well, Sir, no matter about—

Witness—Some of it makes very little sense.

Mr. Evarts—Mr. Fullerton, I will ask you to tell him read it before answering it?

Mr. Fullerton—I will call his attention to it.

Mr. Evarts—Yes, before any answer is given.

Q.—Was the substance of that testimony given before the committee by you? A.—Yes, Sir.

Mr. Evarts—Before any answer is given I ask that he state whether it was or not?

Q.—On your direct examination, Mr. Tilton, you were asked this question, "Have you not frequently asserted the purity of your wife?" to which you answered, "No, I have always had a strange, technical use of words; I have always used words that conveyed that impression; I have taken pains to say that she was a devoted Christian woman. It was like the statement that I carried to Dr. Storrs. I do not think he caught the idea of the statement. As he took it, I do not think that it covers the whole. I have said that Elizabeth was a tender, delicate, kindly Christian woman, which I think she is." Did you answer in substance that?

MR. EVARTS OBJECTS TO THE QUESTION.

Mr. Evarts—Now, if your Honor please, we asked the question whether—I asked him this question on the cross-examination—I remember asking him whether he had not said, in answer to the question, "Have you not frequently asserted the purity of your wife?" "No, I have always had a strange technical use of words; I have always used words that conveyed that impression." That I think was the point to which I asked my question, and I understood the witness to answer that he did not. I don't mean that he exactly said he did not, but that he did not recognize it. He made some comment about the phraseology, about the words and the technical use he made of them.

The Court—Well that was verbal. That was a verbal criticism on what is contained in the book.

Mr. Evarts—I would like to find in my cross-examination anything on the subject, for I don't know exactly what my learned friend proposes.

Mr. Beach—Have you the book of evidence here?

Mr. Morris—Yes, Sir, it is under the table there.

Mr. Evarts—It is on the 700th page.

Mr. Shearman—There it is under the date of Feb. 8.

Mr. Evarts—Now this is the matter that I examined him upon; it is the same examination.

"In answer to this question, 'Have you not frequently asserted the purity of your wife?' did you make this answer: 'No, I have always had a strange technical use of words; I have always used words that conveyed that impression,' and in the answer he says: 'I can't see any sense in that word strange, Sir; I think there must be some misprint; what I meant is that I—' I ask you whether you gave that answer to the question? 'Well, I did not make use of any such words as 'strange technical'; why, Sir, it is evidently a misprint; you can see it. I did not ask anything about that; you did not make that answer? A.—No, Sir. I did not make any such answer; 'a strange technical use of words,' there is something wrong in that. It is not right; I will tell you what I did say—Well, did you say 'I have always used words that conveyed that impression.' A.—I did, Sir; and I always used such words on purpose to convey to everyone the impression that she was a pure and good woman, and if any word carried round the world that impression to-day I should like to utter it from this stand. Well, then, did you use the words to convey the purity of your wife? A.—Yes, Sir; but not in that form; I did not say the purity; I think she is a pure woman. Q.—You used words that conveyed that impression? A.—Yes, Sir. Q.—And you used other words with it with the intention of conveying that impression? A.—Yes, Sir. Q.—And with the effect of conveying it? A.—Yes, Sir, with that deliberate desire. I held, with Mr. Beecher that she is guiltless. Q.—And with the view of accomplishing that fact? A.—Yes, Sir."

Mr. Evarts—That is the cross-examination:

MR. FULLERTON'S PROPOSITION.

Mr. Fullerton—Now, my proposition is to prove what else he said on that occasion on that subject.

The Court—You can do that.

Mr. Evarts—You mean only in answer to that question.

Mr. Fullerton—At present I may not. By and by I shall mean more.

Mr. Evarts—I suppose it is allowable to take the answer to that question.

The Court—Well.

Mr. Fullerton (to the witness)—Now, at the same time using the language that has been recited in your presence in answer to the question put to you by Mr. Evarts—Did you also say: "I have taken pains to say that she was a devoted Christian woman. That necessarily carried the other. It was like the statement that I carried to Dr. Storrs. I do not think he caught the idea of the statement. As he took it, I do not think that it covers the whole. I have said that Elizabeth was a tender, delicate, kindly Christian woman, which I think she is"? Did you say that also in reply to the question, or that in substance? A.—I did not say that about Dr. Storrs, but I said that about Mrs. Tilton; that allusion to Dr. Storrs is very blind and incorrect—bungling; but that allusion to Mrs. Tilton, I am inclined to think, is correct, because I did say that—

[Mr. Fullerton holds the book containing the notes of the testimony referred to.]

Q.—In reply to the question, "At the same time have you not stated that she was as pure as an angel?" did you say "No, Mr. Halliday says I said that; he asked me, in Mrs. Bradshaw's presence, whether or not I had not said that my wife was as pure as gold. 'No,' I said, 'Mr. Halliday, because the conversation to which you allude was this: I said, go and ask Mr. Beecher himself, and he will say that she is as pure as gold;' it is an expression which he used; I have sought to give Elizabeth a good character; I have always wanted to do so; I think she deserves a good character; I think she is better than most of us—better than I am; I do not believe in point of actual moral goodness, barring some drawbacks, that there is in this company so white a soul as Elizabeth Tilton." Did you say that? A.—I think I did, Sir; if I did not say that, I said something like it.

Q.—In answer to the question, "Did you not state in substance to one or more of the gentlemen with whom you were lunching?"—did you answer, "In substance, yes; and I state it now, but I did not use the phrase that she had never violated her chastity?" Was that the substance of your testimony? A.—Yes, Sir.

Mr. Evarts (sotto voce)—Read a little more.

Mr. Beach—There is more that you want to read.

Mr. Fullerton—A great deal more.

WHEN BESSIE TURNER HEARD THE STORY.

Q.—In your cross-examination, Mr. Tilton, this occurred: "Speak of the persons to whom you had communicated the story, the scandal." After naming some of them, you mentioned: "And then, perhaps, I ought to mention that it was a chance interview in my house between Mrs. Tilton and myself, at which Bessie Turner heard the whole story." Do you recollect when that took place? A.—I cannot fix the precise day, but it was the day on which Mrs. Tilton returned from Marietta.

Mr. Evarts—Where is the passage, Mr. Fullerton?

The Witness (resuming the answer)—Either in November or December, 1870.

Mr. Evarts—One moment, Mr. Tilton.

Mr. Evarts—If your Honor please, I was asking him, commencing with an inquiry about whether the sum and substance was not that he had stated that Mr. Beecher had made an unhandsome proposal to three persons. "Q.—Now, when you communicated the whole story that was another matter; but with the exception of those three persons," which he had named, I suppose, "the sum and substance of what you had communicated yourself to other people were the unhandsome proposals and impure advances? A.—Yes, Sir." Then the witness went on, "Then, perhaps, I ought to mention that there was a chance interview between Mrs. Tilton and myself, at which Bessie Turner heard the whole story. Q.—I have not asked you that. I asked you the voluntary communications made to outside people. A.—I don't remember any further communication with outside people." What he said to Bessie Turner was not in answer to any question of mine—to anything drawn out. It was objected to at the time. Now, whatever he said there about Bessie Turner should not be made the basis of the inquiry now by reason of my having introduced it in any cross-examination of mine.

The Court—I see.

MR. FULLERTON ARGUES IN SUPPORT OF HIS POSITION.

Mr. Fullerton—Your Honor will perceive that the learned counsel did not object to that part of the testimony, at all.

The Court—He disclaimed it.

Mr. Fullerton—He disclaimed it only in a measure; the disclaimer was in these words, if it be a disclaimer at all: "I have not asked you that." That is no intimation that he don't take it. It is testimony in this case; it was called out by the question put by counsel on the other side. There was no motion to strike it out. Besides that, it was a proper answer for the witness to make to the question that was put. Now, I call your Honor's attention to the question and to the answer, and you will perceive **that the witness could not discharge his whole duty unless he mentioned that fact, because it was a communication to Bessie Turner; he says that she was present at an interview between himself and his wife, when she learned the whole story; she was permitted to be there;** it was a communication to her; it is a proper signification of the term, and a communication, too, by this witness; when he was asked to whom he had communicated the story, he was under the strongest possible obligations to mention Bessie Turner with the rest, whom he did mention by name as one to whom that story had been revealed. Now, if your Honor will bear with me while I read this again, and see if I am not correct. After mentioning these names, Mr. Evarts says:

"Well, with these exceptions, was the sum and substance of all that you had ever said to the persons to whom you spoke that Mr. Beecher had made unhandsome approaches to your wife—these impure proposals. That is the sum and substance? A.—I did not wish to criminate Mrs. Tilton.

Q.—No matter what you wished. The facts are that that is all you said? A.—That is all I said.

Q.—With the exception of these three persons? A.—Well, understand me, Mr. Evarts, that the three persons to whom I allude are persons to whom I told the story; there were other persons, to whom I talked, to whom Mrs. Tilton told the story and Mrs. Morse told the story.

Mr. Evarts—That you don't know anything about.

The Witness—I do know all about it.

Q.—I am talking about the persons to whom you communicated the information. A.—Yes, but I volunteered the whole story to those three persons, with the addition, perhaps, of Judge Morse.

Q.—About him you don't remember? A.—I don't remember exactly—the exact extent of the conversation with him.

Q.—Now, when you were communicating the whole story, that is another thing; but with the exception of those three persons, the sum and substance of what you communicated yourself to other people was the unhandsome proposals or the impure advances? A.—Yes, Sir;" and then, "Perhaps I ought to mention that there was a chance interview at my house between Mrs. Tilton and myself where Bessie Turner heard the whole story."

Mr. Fullerton—Now, I ask when that took place.

Judge Neilson—I think he may state that.

Mr. Evarts—But, your Honor.

Judge Neilson—Merely the date.

Mr. Fullerton—I do not propose to limit myself to the date.

Mr. Evarts—That I suppose. Now, I start this inquiry with this:

"Now, Sir, did you not say on that occasion, (that is, before the committee,) in answer to this question, I ask what fact you stated against Mr. Beecher to Mr. Bowen; in answer to that question did you not make this answer? A.—'I must answer your questions in my own way. I came to tell you the whole truth and not fragments of the truth. Mr. Bowen wanted me to speak more in the paper about Plymouth Church. Mr. Johnson said: "Perhaps Mr. Tilton has a reason for not going to Plymouth Church," and thereupon Mr. Bowen was curious to know the reason. I, in a solitary phrase, said that there was a personal, domestic reason why I could not go there consistently with my self-respect; that Mr. Beecher had been unhandsome in his approaches to my wife. That is the sum and substance of all I have ever said on this subject to the very few people to whom I have spoken of it.'"

MR. EVARTS READS A PORTION OF THE TESTIMONY.

**Mr. Evarts—Now, that was my question; that is, taking a question and answer from his examination before the Church Committee. In the ordinary form I ask him, "In answer to that question did you not make this answer?" The witness then says, when I propounded to him that question:**

**"What is your question? Q.—Didn't you, in answer to the question read to you, make that answer? A.—I didn't make the last part of that answer, Sir, and I repudiated in a public card that report of my interview. I distinctly before the committee, charged Mr. Beecher with adultery, and they did not put it in the report.**

**Well, now, I am not asking you about that. It has nothing to do with it. I have asked you a simple question, whether in answer to the question I read to you you did not make the answer that I read to you?**

**The Witness—I did not, Sir; in other words, that committee were informed by me—**

**Mr. Evarts—No matter.**

**The Witness—It is the last clause.**

**Mr. Evarts—I have not asked you anything about it.**

**Mr. Beach—Well, he has a right to answer that he made a part of that reply, and part he did not. That is just what he was saying when you interrupted him.**

**Mr. Evarts—No, he was not.**

**Mr. Beach—Well, I say he was.**

**Mr. Evarts—I say he was not.**

**Mr. Beach—Ten minutes will show.**

**Mr. Evarts—He was talking about his repudiation of the report.**

**Mr. Beach—He was not. Sir, when the counsel last interrupted him.**

**Mr. Evarts—Well, I say he was.**

**The Witness—That was the substance of what I said to Mr. Bowen. I didn't tell him the whole story, but I had told others the whole story; but very few.**

**Mr. Evarts—Now, I have not asked you that. You say you did not make that last part of the answer? A.—No, Sir; I say that the answer is imperfect, part of it is omitted; that is the answer that I generally made. There were a few exceptions to that answer, namely, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Moulton, and Mrs. Bradshaw.**

Now I go on with the inquiry:

"Q.—Well, with those exceptions, was the sum and substance of all that you had ever said to the persons to whom you spoke, that Mr. Beecher had made unhandsome approaches to your wife? A.—Yes, Sir; impure proposals; that is the sum and the substance."

And then my learned friend has read on from that, and it ends in this question:

"Now, when you were communicating the whole story, that is another matter—but with the exception of those three persons, the sum and substance of what you communicated yourself to other people was the unhandsome proposals, or the impure advances? A.—Yes, Sir."

Then the witness volunteers:

"And then, perhaps, I ought to mention that there was a chance interview in my house, between Mrs. Tilton and myself, at which Bessie Turner heard the whole story."

Mr. Evarts—I had certainly not introduced that inquiry about any interview in which Mrs. Tilton became a party. I say then: "I have not asked you that," meaning what he said about Mrs. Tilton.

The Court—Your remark to the witness was—

Mr. Evarts—I don't remember any communication from outside people. Then I asked him about what he said to Mr. Moulton, which is this very subject, and now my learned friend says that I have made no motion to strike it out. Well, if your Honor please, I don't understand that when I repudiate the answer as not in answer to my question, that it is in on my introduction without a motion to strike it out.

The Court—It would not have been in but for your interrogatory, and being in you are at liberty to use it in your address to the jury.

Mr. Beach—Certainly.

Mr. Evarts—But I repudiated it; I did not answer it.

The Court—You made an admonition to the witness, which would be a suggestion to be acted upon hereafter, to confine himself to the question, but still it is part, and will stand as well as the other parts of the answer.

MR. EVARTS MOVES THAT IT BE STRICKEN OUT.

Mr. Evarts—Then I move now to strike it out as not called out by any cross-examination of mine; I certainly had no idea that it was in the testimony.

The Court—Well, were you not aware that it was part of the testimony after you read it?

Mr. Evarts—I never read this testimony since.

Mr. Beach—Mr. Evarts will permit me to make a suggestion.

Mr. Evarts—I heard it when it was delivered, but I immediately rejected it.

Mr. Beach—Will you allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. Evarts—Yes, certainly.

MR. BEACH CONTENDS FOR THE ADMISSION OF THE EVIDENCE.

Mr. Beach—If your Honor please, in the first place he called for the persons to whom this witness had communicated the whole story, or put questions properly which led to the naming of three persons to whom the story had been told by this witness, and he then goes on to inquire whether, with the exception of these three persons, he had not uniformly told those with whom he had conversation that the character and extent of the offense was impure proposals on the part of Mr. Beecher. In the course of that inquiry it occurs to the witness that in answer to the first branch of the inquiry he had omitted Bessie Turner. He then says to Mr. Evarts, now, I ought to say, Mr. Evarts, the sense is for the purpose of correcting my previous answer naming only three persons, that there was another person to whom I did tell the whole story, making four persons in all, instead of three. Is it not perfectly proper then, your Honor, and is not evidence to be taken as part of the answer to the first branch of the inquiry as to the persons to whom he had communicated the whole story? Mr. Evarts says now that is not my inquiry, but yet it was a proper answer to the interrogatory which Mr. Evarts previously put, and must stand as testimony in the case. How would the witness stand in this cross-examination if you struck out this branch of the answer?

The Court—I think it stands as part of the testimony.

Mr. Beach—Yes, Sir.

The Court—You are both competent, I think, to use it.

Mr. Evarts—Now, if your Honor please, let us understand, when the witness volunteers a statement not in answer to the question, and counsel then rejects it, is it understood, if the other side did not insist upon it, that it remains in evidence?

The Court—I think it is. I think you are at liberty to use it.

THE ARGUMENT CONTINUED.

Mr. Evarts—It is not introduced by anything in my examination. I had drawn the line of examination as close as possible to this statement that he had made before the committee.

The Court—Well, to all others, these three persons excepted.

Mr. Evarts—He had three persons excepted, and that exception he had a right to make.

The Court—But the introduction of the name of Bessie Turner makes it the fourth.

Mr. Evarts—But I did not inquire what he said to other people at all; as I gave my question I set them all aside.

Mr. Beach—But you inquired of the persons to whom he told the whole story.

Mr. Evarts—I set them all aside, with the exceptions you have made.

The Court—I understand that.

Mr. Evarts—I have not inquired at all what he said to other people.

The Court—That is very plain.

Mr. Evarts—This Bessie Turner matter comes in now as part of what he said to other people. I have not asked a word of what he said to other people, including that.

The Court—I understand that.

Mr. Beach—You asked for the names of the parties to whom he communicated the whole story.

Mr. Evarts—No.

Mr. Beach—And that is calling for what he said.

Mr. Evarts—I am not asking what he said, and, in answering the question which I did ask, he said, with the exception of what he said to three persons to whom he communicated the whole story, that was the sum and substance of it. I did not ask a word about what he said to anybody, except the persons to whom he told the sum and substance of it, and now they say Bessie Turner comes in here as the fourth person. I understand her to be a person to whom no voluntary communication was made. I say I have nothing to do with that. I am asking you as to the persons to whom voluntary statements were made.

The Court—I understand what you asked in your interrogatory was what he stated to these three persons, although it is apparent by the text of the examination that he stated the matter to these persons differently from the statement about the woman you particularly inquired of.

Mr. Evarts—Now, I have not made an inquiry concerning any statement that was made to any other person, so as to give them a right to bring that out; but this matter of Bessie Turner, if it stands upon the testimony, it must stand—and I supposed it was excluded entirely—it must stand in the position of a voluntary communication by him to her. He speaks of it as a chance interview between himself and his wife, in which we may assume there was a conversation, and Bessie Turner thereby, as he says, obtained—

The Court—It is implied that she became possessed of it in some form. This inquiry is as to the date of that occasion.

Mr. Evarts (continuing)—The whole story. Now, in the face of that, it is a confidential communication, overheard by somebody, which is not admitted in evidence by the party to the communication. Bessie Turner is under no such obligation as to preclude her from stating what she overheard.

The Court—I think it is to be excluded; it is excluded from the point that you did not inquire into the conversation.

Mr. Evarts—That is my point, and I think it is a very clear point.

Mr. Beach—If it is not inquiring into the conversation after you took the whole story—

Mr. Evarts—That I did not ask him.

Mr. Beach—And after you took his evidence as to the whole story—

The Court—The whole story differed from the conversation in this—

Mr. Beach—In what respect did it differ, your Honor? What was the whole story?

The Court—It differed in this, that the whole story as related to these three persons was not the same as Bessie Turner overheard.

Mr. Beach—But we understand the whole story, and they are at liberty to say that that was not a charge of adultery; they are at perfect liberty to argue upon that point. If the witness is asked whether he had told the whole story upon a given subject to a party, certainly, Sir, upon re-examination it is admissible what he said.

Mr. Evarts—I did not ask that.

Mr. Beach—You got it out, Sir; you got it out in the evidence, and you have a right to use it, Sir, as the court decides; and if it be in the record as evidence, then we have a right to know what it is, and what constituted, as he says, the whole story.

Mr. Fullerton—I will call your attention again to the question which called out this answer, and I repeat what I have already observed, that the witness was bound under his oath to say—

The Court—I think there was reason for the answer.

Mr. Beach—The sum and substance of the conversation was in reference to the same proposals and the same impure advances, and if he stopped there would it not be proof, and was he not bound to say, that he communicated something else to Bessie Turner beyond impure proposals or solicitations? The counsel on the other side undertook to limit those communications to every person to impure advances or unhandsome proposals, and the witness, having stated in the presence of Bessie Turner the whole story, was bound to say: "Sir, I did more than that: I communicated the whole story to Bessie Turner." Now, the gentleman says he did not call it out. I say that he did call it out.

The Court—You say that in substance and effect it was true.

Mr. Beach—Yes.

MR. FULLERTON'S VIEWS ON THE SUBJECT.

Mr. Fullerton—It is there, and it is because the learned counsel called it out by his question. He put it there; he is bound by it. A lawyer is very apt to take a good thing whether he asks for it or not, if he can get it; and sometimes he has to take something that he does not like because he cannot help himself. And this is just one of those questions; and when he undertook to limit the communications of this witness to all persons to impure proposals, he said: "No, I went beyond that; on one occasion I communicated the whole story to Bessie Turner." I say it is a proper reply; it is a legitimate reply. It was a reply that he was bound to make, and it stands here as evidence in this case; and when the learned counsel comes to sum up this case to the jury he has a right to use that as an instrument against us—that that communication was made to Bessie Turner. And in one view of this case the learned counsel desired to show—and he will claim that he succeeded in showing—that this witness communicated this scandal to various persons to attain some object; and among the rest he will claim that Bessie Turner is to be enumerated. It is certainly very clear, Sir, that that is evidence in this case, and that we have a right to follow it up on this redirect, not only to ascertain when it was said, but what was said.

MR. EVARTS' REPLY TO MR. FULLERTON.

Mr. Evarts—Well, now, my learned friend puts it distinctly upon the proposition that when I am an inquirer of this witness in a line of cross-examination whether or no the sum and substance of what he said to other persons was not—whether he had not stated—that the sum and substance of what he had said to other persons concerning this matter was unhandsome advances or impure proposals, and the witness answers, "No; to certain persons I had said something else." Then I say, "Excepting those persons, was not it all that you said?" And he says, "Yes." And then he says, "Perhaps I ought to say," having named the three persons, "Perhaps I ought to say that in a chance interview between"—[looks at the book containing testimony]—"a chance interview in my house between Mrs. Tilton and myself, at which Bessie Turner heard the whole story." I say, "I do not refer to anything but voluntary communications that you made to outside persons," treating this as a matter between himself and his wife, as it certainly was. Then he says, "I do not remember any other voluntary communications to outside people." Now, it is claimed that because I, not asking anything concerning any interview at which he has said anything but the sum of the interview being that it was impure proposals—that therefore, because he said there were some other people to whom he made other statements, that they have a right to inquire what those statements were. Now, that is what it comes to. Bessie Turner cannot stand any better than the rest. I suppose she will stand very different in reference to the matter as approached and disclosed in regard to the circumstances of its being a statement to her; but that don't alter the proposition which your Honor has made from the bench, whether any course of this inquiry in which I have not asked one word about any interview with anybody, with whom he said that he did not limit his interview to the impure proposals. That was my whole inquiry. I wanted only an answer as to whether he had said so before the Church Committee. He then did, in a discrimination as to what he had said and what he had not said—which was lawful enough—and then came in these inquiries in which I did nothing but exclude all conversations with anybody and everybody which had for their subject anything but the impure proposals. And having set them aside I abstained entirely from any inquiry as to what passed passed between him and those persons. And now my learned friends say that they have a right to introduce it.

THE DATE OF THE CONVERSATION.

The Court—I understand that. Is this date of the Bessie Turner matter material to you?

Mr. Fullerton—Very material to us.

The Court (to the witness)—Then let us have the date. When was this conversation between you and Bessie Turner?

Mr. Evarts—Will your Honor be so good as to note my exception to any inquiry not drawn out by cross-examination, and not lawful in itself to have.

The Witness—I remember very distinctly that it was on the day of Mrs. Tilton's return from Marietta, Ohio. I had gone in the morning with a carriage to meet her at the depot; this conversation took place in the afternoon of the same day, but I do not remember the exact date; I cannot fix the day of the month; it was either toward the close of November, or in the beginning of December, 1870; that is as closely as I can state it.

ANOTHER ARGUMENT ON THE WHOLE STORY.

Q.—Well, you say Bessie Turner heard the whole story. What was the whole story that she heard?

Mr. Evarts—Now, I object to that.

The Court—I must rule that out, Mr. Fullerton; and it is quite apparent now, that as to Bessie Turner, and as to these other persons, he made a statement of this matter quite different from and quite beyond the statement which he had made to the other persons—the statements about which Mr. Evarts has inquired. I do not think he has opened the door to bring in the conversation either with Bessie Turner or with the other three persons, and I have no doubt that we largely understand the attitude of the witness on that subject; certainly I do.

Mr. Fullerton—Well, Sir, I have not any doubt that they understand it, but I think they would understand it a great deal better if they knew what the Bessie Turner story was. Now, your Honor will perceive—

The Court—This is clear, very clear from the whole of the testimony, that as to some of those persons about whom the learned counsel inquired particularly about the statement limited to impure advances, and—

Mr. Fullerton—Yes, Sir.

The Court—Equally clear that as to three or four persons, they heard much more; a very different charge. That is very clear upon the testimony as it stands; but I do not think that he has inquired as to his conversation with those other persons sufficiently to justify us in receiving it.

Mr. Fullerton—Now, your Honor will perceive at a glance the object which the other side had in view in giving this evidence; that in the various conversations between the witness and third persons, he limited the charge against Mr. Beecher to impure advances.

The Court—Well, now we understand the motive of the witness. It has been revealed to us clearly and distinctly—the purpose and motive of the witness, and also the exception as to those four persons.

Mr. Fullerton—That is true, I think, Sir; but I say again, their object as to limit these charges made by the plaintiff in this suit against Henry Ward Beecher of impure proposals. We know just exactly what communications were made to these other persons named; communications that there were impure proposals, and nothing beyond that.

The Court—Well, now, as he was an eye-witness, his version of it to them—whatever his motive might have been, and we understand his motive—don't touch the principal fact at all.

Mr. Fullerton—Oh, Sir, they have laid the foundation for the argument that no adultery was committed because the plaintiff in this case did not charge adultery in these conversations.

The Court—If that act was committed, it would equally exist whether the plaintiff charged it or not. He might qualify it or gloss it over—seek to get rid of it—seek to protect his wife, or be as sentimental as he pleased about it—still that fact would remain.

Mr. Fullerton—Still that fact would remain undoubtedly; but if he glossed it over in nine cases, we could show that in the tenth case he showed it in all its hideous deformity.

The Court—If they had inquired about it, I think you might.

Mr. Fullerton—They asked him if he did not limit himself to impure proposals, and whether he had made other charges against Mr. Beecher to other persons, and he says: "I told the whole story in a conversation with Bessie Turner—in a conversation with my wife at which she was present." Now, we ought to be able to show what that conversation was; we ought to be permitted to make the proof that although he limited that charge to impure advances in several instances, yet in one instance he told the whole truth. We are entitled to that; we are entitled to it in consequence of the course pursued by the other side. Shall they show that a communication was made to Bessie Turner and we not be able to prove what that communication was? I am aware that the counsel upon the other side do not wish it, but I am equally aware that his inquiry called it out. The answer was the legitimate result of that inquiry. And when we learn now that in several instances he qualified this charge, he subdued it, may we not show that in another instance he told it just exactly as it was?

The Court—You could if it was a conversation they inquired into. I think you do not come within that rule, Sir.

Mr. Fullerton—Suppose, Sir, they put Bessie Turner upon the stand to prove that Mr. Tilton did not communicate the whole story to her?

The Court—Then you can recall him to meet that. That is plain enough.

Mr. Fullerton—Well, it is equally plain, I think, that we can prove now what story he did tell.

Mr. Evarts—Then I should have gone into the conversation.

Mr. Fullerton—You would have gone into it a little further, you mean?

Mr. Evarts—I have not gone into it at all.

The Court.—Well, I think I will limit the inquiry now.

Mr. Fullerton—We must adopt it then.

BEECHER'S VISIT TO MRS. TILTON.

Mr. Fullerton—I call your attention, Mr. Tilton, to what occurred between you and Mr. Beecher at the time of the interview on the night of the 30th of December, 1870—who suggested that Mr. Beecher should go and see Elizabeth? A.—Mr. Beecher asked permission to go.

Q.—And you have already given us, I believe, your reply? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—I understood you in your cross-examination, also, that you told Mr. Beecher to go and ask your wife whether she had not written such a letter? A.—No, Sir; I did not. Mr. Evarts asked me if I said such and such a thing.

Mr. Evarts—Well, the record will show what I asked him.

Mr. Fullerton—I want him to explain.

Mr. Evarts—You are not entitled to ask him to explain.

The Court—You may read it, and see what it was.

Mr. Fullerton—We are running into new rules of evidence every day.

Mr. Evarts—The fact that I cross-examined the witness does not give a right to ask him to explain his cross-examination.

The Court—Suppose there is an inadvertance, a blunder.

Mr. Evarts—I agree. Then let it be brought up in proper form.

Mr. Fullerton—I shall not bring it up in any other form, because I am correct about it.

Mr. Evarts—Your Honor understands, and has very carefully protected the rights of these parties in regard to both parties, and we wish that that adherence to rights should be maintained throughout. Now, the direct examination was this—

The Court—I recollect it included a very solemn injunction that he says he gave the defendant on the occasion of his going.

Mr. Evarts—I didn't introduce any new matter at all. I cross-examined him about that.

The Court—Now, if you get a new answer, or a statement in a different form, he can call for an explanation.

Mr. Fullerton—Here is a question that was put by him upon cross-examination: "You then said to him, 'It is but a few squares to my house; go and ask Mrs. Tilton for yourself, whether or not she wrote that letter?' A.—Ah! that was my suggestion, not his.

Q.—I ask you whether you did not say that to him? A.—I don't remember using any such expression as that; you take that from my examination before the committee."

The Witness—That was one of the softening passages from the "true story," as it is called.

Mr. Evarts—No matter about that. I ask that that be stricken out.

Mr. Fullerton—Again: "I am not asking about that. I am trying to get the facts. Did you say, 'It is but a few squares to my house; go and ask Mrs. Tilton for yourself whether or not she wrote that letter?' A.—Well, I may perhaps have used some such expression; I don't remember; but it was not in reference to any doubt."

Mr. Evarts—Well, next. "No matter; you used the expression. A.—But only as to surprise." Now, that is all that I introduced.

WITH WHOM DID THE SUGGESTION ORIGINATE.

The Court—Read this question, Mr. Stenographer.

Mr. Fullerton—My question now is, whether the suggestion originated with him, or with Mr. Beecher, that Mr. Beecher should go and see Mrs. Tilton?

The Court—I think he can answer that. What is it? A.—The suggestion originated with Mr. Beecher.

Mr. Beach—There is, Sir, an apparent inconsistency between those two answers, and I ask that the witness may be permitted to explain what he means by an answer he gave on cross-examination, that he told Mr. Beecher to go and see his wife, and see whether she wrote that letter, whereas now he answers that the suggestion came from Mr. Beecher.

The Court—My apprehension of it is that Mr. Beecher having spoken of going himself, introducing the idea of going—

Mr. Beach—Very well, Sir. I want it to so to appear upon the records. Your Honor's ingenuity, of course, could get the correct explanation; but it should be upon the evidence.

Mr. Evarts—I will not now comment upon the evidence. The question is upon the getting of it. This witness, who is also a party, had a very free utterance of this interview, without interruption, in his own way. I cross-examined him as to a particular point, and in that cross-examination he has given the answers that have been read to your Honor, and which come to

suggested it? A.—She was a friend of our family, a protégé of my wife, a member of a family whose members had interchanged visits with our house. She had been a school-girl in Connecticut; she had been sick with a very severe illness; she had come to my house to be nursed during her illness, and after her recovery I was going to Winsted to lecture one day. I had, in the previous year, been to that town with Mrs. Tilton, and we had such a pleasant hospitality in the house of a certain family that I asked Mrs. Tilton if she would like to go there with me, but she was unable to come, and she asked me to take Miss Blank—I would not mention her name here—and so I got ready to start; got my bag packed, and I took this little girl with me. I expected to be entertained in the house which entertained myself and Mrs. Tilton the year before, but the family were away from home, and so we went to the hotel. That is the whole story. There never was a purer girl than she is, and it is an outrage to introduce her name in any reference to this case.

HIS SPENDTHRIFT TENDENCIES.

Q.—In one of your letters, Mr. Tilton, you have spoken of your spendthrift tendencies. But before you answer that question, what was the young girl's age? A.—I don't know, Sir; she was a young school-girl; I never asked her age.

Mr. Beach—Well, about her age, from her appearance? A.—I should say sixteen or seventeen years of age, or perhaps more; I don't know her age.

Q.—Well now, in one of your letters you have spoken of your spendthrift tendencies, and asked your wife to check you. What had you reference to, what character of expense? A.—Well, Sir, I was always buying things to beautify my house—pictures, books, furniture, and other luxurious frivolities which very rich men can indulge in, and men who are not very rich cannot. That is all. Perhaps I do not exactly understand the character of the question.

Mr. Fullerton—That is a sufficient answer; I wanted to show it was not in riotous living.

Witness—What is that, Sir?

Mr. Fullerton—I wanted to show it was not in riotous living, Sir.

Witness—No, Sir; I never indulge in riotous living.

Mr. Fullerton—I suppose not.

Mr. Evarts—There is no inquiry of that kind, and I ask that it be stricken out.

Mr. Fullerton—The riotous living?

Mr. Evarts—Yes, Sir; that he did not indulge in riotous living.

Mr. Beach—Well, Sir, it is a very proper answer.

Mr. Evarts—No; there was no question to elicit it.

THE CONVERSATION WITH MR. SCHULTZ.

Q.—Do you recollect a conversation you had with Mr. Jackson S. Schultz in regard to your matters? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—State what you said to him?

Mr. Evarts—Is it in reference to the conversation I inquired about?

Mr. Fullerton—Of course.

Witness—I went to Mr. Franklin Woodruff either in January or February, 1871, before the founding of the *Golden Age*. I went with Mr. Woodruff to see Mr. Jackson S. Schultz. We went over to his store; we were told by his partner that Mr. Schultz was at home; we went to Mr. Schultz's house; he was very sick with the gout, and he gave us some good advice not to indulge in what you call riotous living, and Mr. Woodruff laid out before Mr. Schultz the prospect for the establishment of the *Golden Age*, and he asked Mr. Schultz to contribute to the capital and become one of the stockholders. Quite a long conversation ensued between Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Schultz, I taking a very subordinate part. Toward the end of that conversation Mr. Schultz said that the enterprise was one of a character which ought to have the indorsement of Mr. Beecher; he said that if Mr. Beecher would take part in the paper, or would approve of it, it would be likely to succeed. I told Mr. Schultz—Mr. Schultz asked me if Mr. Beecher was interested in it; I told him that Mr. Beecher had expressed a willingness to become interested in it, to do something for it, and there followed some conversation between Mr. Schultz and myself. I cannot repeat the phraseology of it, but the pith of it was this, that I could not put myself under any obligation to Mr. Beecher, but I did not tell Mr. Schultz the reason why.

Q.—That was the substance of the conversation? A.—That was the substance of the conversation. Mr. Woodruff was present throughout the conversation.

Q.—In many of these letters which have been introduced in evidence, written by your wife, she speaks of Mr. B. Who was the B. of whom she spoke? A.—Rev. Henry Ward Beecher.

Q.—And was Bessie Turner known by any other name in the family, and was she mentioned in any other way than as Bessie Turner in the family? A.—She was known as Libby.

Q.—And wherever Libby occurs on the correspondence reference was had to Bessie Turner? A.—Yes, Sir.

THE TRIPARTITE AGREEMENT AND THE BOWEN AWARD.

Q.—Was there any connection at all between the payment of the $7,000 by Mr. Bowen and the execution of the tripartite agreement which has been put in evidence? A.—Not the slightest, Sir.

Q.—I understood you to say that the $7,000 was paid in advance of the execution of that paper? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Was it understood that it was to be precedent to the execution of the paper? A.—No, Sir; no connection whatever between the two things. As I understand there was not a shadow of a connection between them.

Q.—You have been asked whether you did not tell the story to Mr. Johnston, Mr. Richards, and others, including Mrs. Bradshaw.

Witness—What did you state about Mrs. Bradshaw?

Mr. Evarts—I did not ask anything about that.

Mr. Fullerton—Yes, you have.

Mr. Evarts—Not in the least; there is something in the direct examination about it; I have not asked him anything concerning what he told Mrs. Bradshaw.

Mr. Fullerton—The gentleman forgets.

Mr. Evarts—I have not asked any question concerning it.

The Court—There were so many questions put that I cannot assume to remember them all, of course.

Mr. Fullerton—It seems the learned counsel has put so many questions he has forgotten them himself.

Mr. Evarts—Where in the record is mention made of them?

Mr. Fullerton—He asked the question whether he told this story to others, and he mentioned Mr. Johnston, Mr. Richards, Mrs. Richards, and Mrs. Bradshaw.

Mr. Evarts—The same subject has just been gone over, and your Honor excluded it?

The Court—Yes, Sir.

Mr. Fullerton—No, not the same subject.

The Court—That is one of the persons classed as among the three.

Mr. Evarts—She is one of the three persons.

Mr. Fullerton—No, Sir; it is at another time; it was another inquiry, and as to another subject altogether. The other inquiry was as to the showing of the "true story" to Mr. De Witt, and Mr. Duncan, and Mr. Clarke, and others.

The Court—Can you find that, Mr. Beach?

Mr. Beach—I will try, Sir.

Mr. Evarts—It all relates to the same subject matter.

The Court—Looking for a needle in a haystack.

Mr. Beach—Or looking for a diamond on the sea-shore.

Mr. Fullerton—While they are looking for it I will go on with something else.

The Court—Well, go on.

HIS VISITS TO MRS. WOODHULL'S.

Q.—You have spoken of several visits which you have made to Mrs. Woodhull at her residence in the City of New-York. I wish to ask you whether, at the time that these visits were respectively made, her husband was at home? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—In every instance? A.—I think he was, Sir, in every one. I don't think I was ever at her house when he was not there.

Q.—You have spoken of going through her house and through every room in her house—at whose request was that? A.—At Mrs. Woodhull's request.

Q.—What object did she expect to accomplish by taking you through all her rooms? A.—She asked me if I heard that the house was spoken of as a house of ill repute, and I replied that I had heard it. She then asked me if I would do her the favor to see the answer which she would make to that, and I said I would listen. She said, "I don't want you to listen, but I wish to show you something—I wish to show you the house." And she took me through the house, and, as I have already stated, it was perfectly empty, like a new house.

Q.—What was her ordinary demeanor and deportment in your presence while you were at her house? A.—She always acted like a perfect lady.

Q.—In her conduct and conversation? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Did you ever see anything amiss with her husband during your acquaintance with him? A.—No, Sir; he always conducted himself like a perfect gentleman.

Q.—Did they by word and deed try to impress you with the idea that their life and walk and conversation were correct? A.—Yes, Sir.

Mr. Evarts—That I object to. I object to "by word and deed."

The Court—I think the other answer covers the whole ground.

Mr. Fullerton—I will cover the whole ground if I am permitted to. An imputation is attempted to be cast upon this witness because he went to see this lady and her husband at their house, and I want to show their demeanor, and that it was perfectly correct.

The Court—I think you have a right to show that.

Mr. Evarts—That he has asked, and that I don't object to. I object to what he has said, and to the words, "word and deed."

A DISCUSSION ON ONE OF BEECHER'S LETTERS.

Q.—A letter has been introduced in evidence, written by Mr. Beecher to Mrs. Tilton subsequently to the publication of the Woodhull scandal, and it has no date. Do you remember when that letter was written? A.—Yes, Sir; it was written a long while after the slander.

Q.—How long? A.—Well, I was going to say six months; perhaps that is an overstatement; certainly four or five months.

Q.—Do you know how it happened that it was written so long after the slander? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—State.

Mr. Evarts—Well, if he knows about its being written from what occurred between him and Mr. Beecher, that is an interview.

The Court—How is that?

Mr. Evarts—I say if the witness knows from what occurred between him and Mr. Beecher, then that is an interview. If not already included in the gentleman's inquiries, it might have been. There is no other mode of knowledge that affects us.

The Court—Well, it was written some months afterward. Doesn't that cover the ground?

Mr. Fullerton—No, Sir, not at all. There was a reason for writing it then. I want to know that reason.

The Court—Well, let him answer in the most general form what the reason was, without giving—

Mr. Evarts—My point is that he must be confined to what passed between him and Mr. Beecher. Nothing else binds us.

The Court—Well, on such a point as that there might be a reason stated, although not in the presence of Mr. Beecher. I allow the question as it stands.

Mr. Evarts—I except to the ruling.

The Court—Yes. Well, gentlemen, you may give the conversation. Let him state the reason as short as possible.

The Witness—During the first four or five months after the Woodhull scandal a great many people asked Elizabeth what Mr. Beecher had done about it.

Mr. Evarts—Now, I object to that.

Mr. Fullerton—Well, Sir, it is a fact I have a right to show.

Mr. Evarts—I move to strike that out.

The Court—No, let it stand.

Mr. Evarts—It is certainly improper for the witness to state what a great many people asked Elizabeth.

The Court—It is simply getting at the reason.

Mr. Evarts—Well, there is an objection.

The Court—Let it stand.

Mr. Evarts—Certainly, because there is a reason that cannot be got at, it does not authorize evidence that is inadmissible *per se*.

The Court—He proceeds to enumerate the reasons; and the first may be the suggestions of other people, and then what?

Mr. Evarts—Yes, Sir; and that may tolerate, on this notion, a long conversation between himself and his wife.

The Court—No, I do not propose to take that—a long conversation.

Mr. Fullerton—It is a part of the *res gestæ*, Sir.

Mr. Evarts—I do not so understand.

The Court—It is proper, I think, for him to state that it was a subject of conversation between him and his wife, and that was a reason for the writing of the letter.

Mr. Evarts—But he said it was a subject of inquiry, and that a great many people had asked of Elizabeth about it.

The Court—I deny the motion.

The Witness—They wanted to know whether Mr. Beecher had said to her—whether he had given her any expression of sympathy—

The Court—That is enough. Do not go on with the answer.

Mr. Evarts—I move to strike it out.

The Court—No, I decline to strike it out.

Mr. Evarts—Your Honor will note my exception.

Mr. Fullerton—How long after this inquiry was made was this letter written to her? A.—This letter was written to her while those inquiries were being made, and the letter was written for the purpose of putting into her hands—

Mr. Evarts—I object.

The Witness—Something that she could show to her friends.

Mr. Evarts—I object.

The Witness—That is what Mr. Beecher said.

Mr. Evarts—I will object, if the witness will stop. I object to his stating what the letter was written for unless it proceeds from Mr. Beecher as a reason why it was written.

The Court—Bring it within that rule.

Mr. Evarts—Was that struck out?

The Court—I understand that to be a statement of Mr. Beecher's.

Mr. Evarts—He has not so said. I move that it be struck out, Sir.

The Court (to the stenographer)—Read that last clause, Sir.

The Stenographer (reading)—"This letter was written to her while those inquiries were being made, and the letter was written for the purpose of putting into her hands something that she could show to her friends. That is what Mr. Beecher said."

Q.—When did he say that? A.—He didn't say it to me; he said it to Mr. Moulton. I had nothing to do except to carry it—

Mr. Evarts (to the stenographer)—This last part of the answer was given after I had made my objection?

The Stenographer—Yes, Sir, after.

Mr. Evarts—I move to strike it out.

The Court—The motion is denied.

Mr. Evarts—Please note our exception.

Q.—Did you carry the letter? A.—Yes, Sir, from Mr. Moulton's house.

Q.—Did Mr. Moulton give it to you? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—There is one question I omitted to ask in regard to the tripartite agreement: Were you willing to sign the tripartite agreement after you had read—become acquainted with the contents of the article which referred particularly to you?—the original tripartite agreement, as it was before? A.—No, Sir, the original draft of the tripartite agreement I refused to sign.

WHEN HIS WIFE WAS AT MONTICELLO.

Q.—Do you recollect when your wife was at Monticello? A.—She was there in the Summer of 1869. I think she was there more Summers than one.

Q.—How, Sir? A.—I was just thinking that she was there more Summers than one. I was there with her one Summer. I think she was there two or three years in succession. I know she was there in the Summer of 1869.

Q.—Do you recollect what time she went in 1869? A.—She went shortly after the baby was born.

Q.—Do you recollect her return—what time it was? A.—Yes, Sir; I recollect her return, because I went after her, and she came away, and we crossed each other on the road.

Q.—You did start to go after her? A.—Yes, Sir; I started to go and make a surprise visit to her, and when I got there I found she had gone.

Q.—Did you see this Catharine Carey that was on the stand yesterday? A.—I was here yesterday, yes, Sir.

Q.—You saw the witness? A—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Did you recognize her as a former servant of yours? A.—Yes, Sir.

A.—As the servant that went to Monticello with your wife? A.—Well, I could not have said that. I do not remember enough about the servants, but I remember that she was a nurse.

Q.—In the family? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Now, Mr. Tilton, in one of your letters which has been put in evidence, you speak [Mr. Fullerton here paused to examine the book of evidence in the case.] I call your attention to Exhibit D 98, dated Brooklyn, Aug. 28, 1869. [Reading:] "My Dear Wife: I find my self alone but not lonesome, weary but not sleepy, restless but not without peace of soul, to-night; and so I turn my thoughts to you and the children in your mountain nest?" Where was the mountain nest? A.—Will you let me look at that a moment?

[Mr. Fullerton handed the book to the witness.]

Q.—I suppose it is in Monticello; that is the reason I ask the question. A.—Yes, Sir; this was a letter which I wrote from home in Brooklyn to Mrs. Tilton at Monticello.

Mr. Fullerton (having forgotten the answer after a pause)—What is the answer?

The answer was read by the stenographer.

Mr. Tilton—Monticello was a little village in Sullivan County, in this State, situated in the mountains.

Q.—On a very high eminence, is it not? A.—Yes, Sir; and very pure air.

IDENTIFYING PAPERS.

Q.—Look at the paper I now show you, and say in whose handwriting it is? [Paper handed witness.] A.—Henry Ward Beecher's.

Q.—See if there is any writing upon it in the handwriting of any other person? You need not state whose it is. A.—Yes; this is in another person's hand; the words written on the back of page 3 are not in Mr. Beecher's hand.

Q.—The words written in lead-pencil on the back of page 3 are not his handwriting?. A.—No, Sir.

Mr. Fullerton directed the stenographer to mark it in evidence; but he not knowing the number, the court inquired of Mr. Shearman. Mr. Morris said it was D 105: Mr. Shearman said it should be D 103; in which Mr. Morris acquiesced.

Q.—In whose handwriting is the paper now shown you? A.—Mrs. Tilton's.

[Marked for identification D 104.]

Q.—In whose handwriting is the paper I now show you? A.—Mrs. Tilton's; all except the lead-pencil mark at the top.

[Marked D 105.]

Mr. Fullerton—If the court please, I owe an apology or an explanation to the other side, in offering these two letters. I promised to do it before the close of the cross-examination, but the cross-examination was so long that I forgot it.

[The letters were then handed to Mr. Evarts by Mr. Fullerton.]

Mr. Fullerton continued—We find that there were some letters written at Monticello, which I desire to introduce, to fix the date, more distinctly the time, when Mrs. Tilton was there, in 1869.

A long delay here occurred, owing to an effort on the part of Mr. Beach to find the particular testimony heretofore referring to this subject.

Mr. Fullerton (to the witness)—Look at the paper I now show you, and see whether it enables you to state how late in August your wife was at Monticello in 1869? A.—This letter is dated Monticello, Aug. 24.

Q.—No. I did not ask that. I ask you if it enables you to state how late she was there? A.—She must have been there the very last day.

Mr. Fullerton—In August, 1869. [Another pause here occurred.]

Judge Neilson said: "Mr. Beach, it seems to me that occurs quite late in the cross-examination, whatever it is."

Mr. Evarts—These letters that are now proposed to be introduced—the letters from Mrs. Tilton to her husband—are not letters referring to any letters that have been introduced on our part, and they are not letters that have been communicated to Mr. Beecher, in regard to which he has no relation. That is not proposed. They are dated—one being in 1871—July, 1871—and the other, it may be assumed, late in 1872, though there is only a memorandum of that date—I suppose that is supposed to be correct—and they are often the alleged cause of complaint on the part of this husband against Mr. Beecher, made the subject of this action, and are not admissible under any rules of evidence, being entirely passages between himself and his wife, and not admissible in the light in which other passages have been introduced—to wit, of the condition of their family relations before the occurrence.

Judge Neilson—The authorities on that are that, in a case of this kind, to show the relation of the family—domestic happiness or unhappiness—the plaintiff may put in correspondence prior to the alleged offense, or to the knowledge of it.

Mr. Evarts—To the knowledge of it.

Judge Neilson—And the other side may put in letters also to combat the suggestion, and I think the limit is there; prior to the knowledge of the offense.

Mr. Evarts—It is very well settled, I believe.

Mr. Fullerton—Well, Sir, I think not, Sir; the rule is subject to some exceptions; they have introduced some letters.

Mr. Evarts—That may be, if they are not objected to.

Mr. Fullerton—That forecloses the other side; they cannot object. They have introduced a number of them.

Mr. Evarts—That doesn't foreclose us in the least if they don't object to the letters; there is no rule of that kind; they may find advantage in having them.

THE RULE DOES NOT APPLY TO THE QUESTION BEFORE THE COURT.

Mr. Fullerton—Now, taking the rule as your Honor has stated it, you will perceive that it does not apply to the question now before the court, because the defense in this case have introduced part of that since the alleged cause of complaint. They have done that, and they have exposed themselves to the balance of the correspondence between the parties during that period. It is very plain, Sir, that we are entitled to this correspondence.

Mr. Evarts—Well—

Judge Neilson—In view of that I am inclined to receive the letters.

MR. EVARTS PERSEVERES IN HIS OPPOSITION.

Mr. Evarts—If your Honor please, they cannot give the letters in evidence anyway. We can give in evidence anything that affects this defendant—this plaintiff. They cannot; their right to introduce in evidence letters between husband and wife grows out of their right to show relations between them before the invasion, or knowledge of the invasion, of the domestic purity; that is the only way. On the face of the matter they have no right to give in evidence a letter from one to the other, and on the face of the matter we have a right to give in evidence anything that affects this opposite party to us. That is the difficulty. They overlook that. The general rules of evidence allow us to affect him with letters, as the general rules of evidence allow them to affect Mr. Beecher. But the special rule on the special motives permits the interchange between husband and wife of observed demeanor, or of letters to be brought in as a part of the domestic conjugal relation which may be thus proved.

Mr. Fullerton—Now—

Mr. Evarts (continuing)—Now, these letters are not in evidence; that seems to be conceded. Now, how are they brought in under any general law of evidence that enables them to put in evidence letters between their party and a third person? Now, there is nothing in the proposition that because we have given some letters between the years 1870 and 1874—or wherever we have given them—[to Judge Porter]—What have we given them to?

Judge Porter—1871.

Mr. Evarts—Well, 1871.

Mr. Beach—1869.

Mr. Pryor—The law is not to knowledge. Mr. Evarts; it is as to the date. There is no authority for it in any book.

Mr. Evarts—It is down to the date of the knowledge.

Mr. Pryor—No.

Judge Neilson—He has an authority, I think.

Mr. Pryor—No, he has not. It is to the date.

Mr. Evarts—Well, let's see if we can't find an authority. Lord Kenyon, in a case of *crim. con.* between the plaintiff and the wife, admitted letters to show the state of their affection, and written before there was any suspicion of the adultery of the wife. That is the point, as to how they are going on in their domestic life before the discovery of the offense. The rule is as we have stated.

Judge Neilson—It don't prove the fact.

Mr. Evarts—I agree; it is the state of their happiness until the discovery of the fact makes the disruption.

THE COURT SEEKS INFORMATION.

Judge Neilson—Now, Mr. Fullerton, let us see why it is admissible.

Mr. Evarts—I was going to say with certain qualifications, if we put in a letter to which either of these was an answer, that would be under another rule of evidence.

Mr. Fullerton—The rule, as your Honor has stated it, is undoubtedly correct, that we would have no right whatever to introduce a correspondence between the husband and wife which occurred subsequent to the alleged offense, but the other side had a right to do it, and they have availed themselves of that right, and have given in evidence in this case several letters which passed between Mr. and Mrs. Tilton subsequent to December, 1870, when this alleged offense was made known to Mr. Beecher.

Mr. Beach—All letters of Mrs. Tilton.

WHAT WAS THE OBJECT OF INTRODUCING THE LETTERS?

Mr. Fullerton—Yes, Sir, letters of Mrs. Tilton to her husband. Now, what was the object of introducing those letters? Let us look for a moment. It was not to show that the husband and wife lived together harmoniously. That was not their object. That was one of the objects which we had in view in introducing the correspondence. They had another, and a further, and a deeper object. They wanted to show letters written subsequent to December, 1870, when this offense was made known to Mr. Beecher by Mr. Tilton, for the purpose of convincing this jury that no woman who had submitted herself to the embraces of a paramour would ever have written such a letter to her husband. That is their object. And when my learned friend on the other side comes to sum up this case to the jury, if the case stands as it does now, he will flaunt this in our faces and say, "There is the evidence that this charge is false, because those are the letters of an innocent woman." Now, Sir, they have tried the experiment, and they must reap the fruits of it. Whenever they go into a correspondence subsequent to 1870, they open the door and they cannot shut it at their will. We can read letters between these parties for the purpose of combating the position which they intend to take, as predicated upon the evidence as it stands on their part. Now, Sir, that is the doctrine of this case. Any letter now written by Mrs. Tilton to her husband subsequent to December, 1870, we can introduce as evidence in this case for the purpose of doing away with any inference which they seek to draw from the correspondence given by them, which occurred during the same period.

THE POINT INVOLVED.

Judge Neilson—That is the point—the very point involved. Whether, they having put in some letters which might possibly affect the question—

Mr. Fullerton—Why, Sir, they have—

Judge Neilson (continuing)—You can put in other letters to qualify it?

Mr. Fullerton—Yes, Sir. They have entered upon a line of investigation here; we can pursue that line of investigation; we can give evidence of the same character and the same purport to explain away and get rid of the testimony which they have given of that character. Nothing can be clearer than that. And whenever they try the experiment of coming down subsequent to 1870 for the purpose of introducing letters between husband and wife, they have opened the door for the whole correspondence between the parties at that time. That is our position.

MR. BEACH REFERS THE COURT TO AN AUTHORITY.

Mr. Beach—May I refer your Honor to an authority upon this subject? If opportunity were given, I have no idea, Sir, but cumulative decisions to the same effect could be given with great readiness. I understand the rule to be that, where a party enters upon a line of immaterial or irrelevant evidence, or incompetent evidence, that the opposite party have a right to follow the lead thus given and to enter upon the same class of evidence. I am not, though, sufficiently familiar at this moment with the rule to say whether it is an absolute right upon the part of the opposite party to give that proof—answering proof, and your Honor will perceive that it might lead, under certain circumstances to a great waste of time, if the court should allow irrelevant evidence to be produced by one party because the other had been permitted to present it. And we may therefore qualify the rule to this extent, I think, with propriety: That it is a subject which depends upon the discretion of the court, to be exercised reasonably and justly with reference to the subject matter, and the particular circumstances which are, upon an occasion, brought to the attention of the court, and that seems to be the result. Sir, of an expression to be found in Phillips on Evidence, where it is said: "The cases do not agree upon the question of whether irrelevant testimony, being given on one side for the assumed purpose of proving a fact, will warrant other testimony in reply to that so given, either to repudiate it directly as touching upon the fact upon which it professes to bear. The result would seem to be that it is discretionary with the court to hear or reject the evidence in reply. In many cases, indeed all, the extent of the testimony would be endless, if the court have no power to interfere."

Judge Neilson—Is that the text or note?

Mr. Beach—The note. It is Cowen's Notes; I think it is Edwards' Edition. Yes, Sir, it is the additional notes of Mr. Edwards. Now, your Honor will perceive that in the evidence which we offer, which consists only of a letter or two—two or three letters—which were inadvertently omitted, on our direct examination there can be no great waste of the time of the court; the examination is not likely to proceed to an extent that will be tedious and important. If this is a question—and it is a concession I am disposed to make—dependent upon the discretion of your Honor, it seems to me that the appeal which we make to that discretion must be invincible. My associate has stated the object of the evidence which they introduced—that in the freedom of inquiry which we chose to permit on the other side in regard to the relations existing between this husband and wife, we made no objection to this evidence which they offered. Assuming it to be irrelevant, we permitted them to give letters from Mrs. Tilton to Mr. Tilton, and the reverse, without objection, the whole object being that so forcibly expressed by my associate to your Honor. Now, in the exercise of your Honor's discretion, Sir—they having pursued just that character of proof for the purpose which is obvious—it seems to me it would be harsh and unjust to permit—to deny the introduction of letters from Mrs. Tilton to a very limited extent bearing directly upon a question possessing none of the uncertainties of parol evidence, leading to no injurious waste of the time of this court, and necessary, Sir, for a proper explanation of the relations between the parties, that being the subject to which their evidence referred. And we appeal to your Honor's discretion—anxious to do justice between these parties, solicitous to ascertain the real truth in regard to those relations, but exercising it in a spirit and with an authority which will lead to those results. And I, without enlarging, Sir, or pressing motives upon your Honor, submit that it would be a harsh and an extremely unjust exercise of that discretion to permit the gentlemen on the other side to pursue themselves this character of evidence, and not permit us, to a very brief extent, to answer it by the evidence we propose.

IS THE PROPOSED EVIDENCE LEGAL?

Mr. Evarts—The question has nothing to do with discretion or relevancy. Those topics are all remote from any considerations here, which are legal, right, and perfectly-well-settled rules of evidence. Now, my learned friends have so often pleased themselves with saying what I shall say in my summing up, that I am afraid when I come to sum up I shall be anticipated in every point. The question here is whether the evidence now proposed is legal or not? I object to it. It is said that we have put in evidence a letter subsequent in date to the point of discovery alleged by the complaining husband. The "Catherine Gaunt" letter, as it is called, is the only letter of that kind and of that date that we have put in evidence.

Mr. Beach—You are mistaken, Mr. Evarts.

Mr. Evarts—Well, show us another. I don't think we are. It isn't from any want of pains on our part to find out whether there was another. If you can point us to anything else we will correct it.

Mr. Morris (to Mr. Pryor)—What is the difference; one is as good as a dozen.

Mr. Pryor—Oh, they have put in others. We haven't time to find them now.

Mr. Evarts—Well, I may assume the "Catherine Gaunt" letter is the only one.

Mr. Morris—I am quite certain there are others.

Mr. Evarts—Well, we will consider it after recess; it is ten minutes after the usual time.

Mr. Beach (to Mr. Evarts)—You mean the only letter subsequent to—

Mr. Shearman—December, 1870.

Mr. Evarts—We shall lose our recess entirely if we don't go now.

Judge Neilson (to the Jury)—Gentlemen, you will return at a quarter past two o'clock. Let the jury pass out first.

The court then took a recess until 2:15 P. M.

*AFTER RECESS.*

After the Clerk had called the jury,

Mr. Beach said: May I be permitted to introduce an authority or two upon the question under discussion before adjournment? It was contended on the part of the defendant that evidence about correspondence between Mrs. Tilton and Mr. Tilton, as relating to their domestic intercourse—its character—was admissible only after the discovery of the offense charged.

Mr. Evarts—Before.

Mr. Beach—Only before the discovery of the offense charged. That is, the discovery, or, as they say, well-grounded suspicion of the offense, is the point at which the limit of inquiry is fixed. My associate, Mr. Pryor, upon the authority of Mr. Greenleaf, took the position that the evidence was limited to the time of the act of commission, and there are, I think, many reasons to support that proposition. He hands me 2d Greenleaf, section 57 of part 4: "The letters of the wife, in order to be admitted in favor of the husband, must have been written before any attempt at adulterous intercourse had been made by the defendant." Referring to the case of Wilten against Webster, 7th Carrington and Paine, 198: "Whenever her letters are introduced as expressive of her feelings they must have been of a period anterior to the existence of any facts tending to raise a suspicion of her misconduct, and when there existed no ground to impute collusion in defendant of the existence of facts—not of suspicions, but of facts tending to raise any suspicion of adulterous intercourse." Your Honor will perceive how fugitive and uncertain would be the limit which should be founded upon the question of the existence of suspicion of adultery, because those suspicions would be varied according to the character of the different persons who might be placed in that situation. Therefore the limit is the fact of adulterous intercourse, or such congenital facts as would lead to the suspicion of its existence. I think, therefore, it is clear that the proposition of my learned associate is correct, but I do not consider it, Sir, as particularly important upon the question of the admissibility of the proof we now offer, for the reason that they have given evidence upon their side subsequent to their own established limit; and the precise question before your Honor is, whether as a matter of right, or a matter of discretion, whether they, having given that evidence without objection upon our part, which under the rule which they have established would be inadmissible, as irrelevant and incompetent—they can properly object to the introduction of similar evidence upon our part in answer to the proof which they have given. [Mr. Fullerton here whispered a suggestion to Mr. Beach.]

FURTHER AUTHORITIES.

In the 5th of Barbour, at page 516, in the case of Mars against Stone, the syllabus is, after evidence has been given by the plaintiff in regard to the mortgage without objection, that is, parol evidence, and special inquiries in regard to its contents have been made by the defendant, both parties will be considered as having acquiesced in receiving parol evidence of the mortgage; the defendant cannot then object to the plaintiff's proving at what time the mortgage fell due. The Court, says the learned Justice before whom this case was tried at Circuit, decided correctly in receiving parol evidence to show when the mortgage held by the plaintiff on Dutcher's horse became due. The defendant's counsel had previously given some evidence in regard to that mortgage, and this objection was not made until the plaintiff's counsel had also made several inquiries in regard to its contents. The defendant's counsel could not then object to proving the single fact when the mortgage fell due without also objecting to all the previous evidence of its contents. I think that it must be held that both parties had acquiesced in receiving parol evidence of the mortgage. Now, that could have been sustained under an exception which was taken only upon the ground that the production of this answering evidence was a matter of legal right, or was properly the subject of the exercise of judicial discretion, and in either sense the Court held that it was a proper exercise of power upon the part of the trial court to admit the proof. And again, in Phillips' Evidence speaking of this question of answering irrelevant testimony: "In assumpsit against several partners, one of them introduced a letter of his copartner to the plaintiff, which, it was insisted, made against him. In consequence of this the plaintiff offered to show that the same copartner, in answer to certain interrogatories, had contradicted what he said in his letter." A parallel case in principle: "This was objected to by the defendant, who produced the letter, and it was received. Held—No error, as the defendant himself had laid the foundation of it." Now, see; this was a case where one party had asked the other in regard to the declaration made. The court then received the declarations, not at the same time, but upon the same subject made upon other occasions, which contradicted the declarations which had been improperly received in evidence without objection. And that is precisely, Sir, the attitude of this question.

THE REAL IMPORT OF THE LETTERS INTRODUCED BY THE DEFENSE.

They have given in evidence a letter subsequent to December, 1870, for some purpose. The manifest object of the introduction of the letter is to show certain expressions of sympathy and regard upon the part of this wife toward her husband. The letter was offered to show relations after an event, after the revelation of an event, inconsistent entirely with the truth of that alleged event. We are not anticipating the argument of the counsel. We suppose it will be founded upon the evidence, and that no question which can be raised upon that proof in favor of his client will escape the ingenuity and ability of our learned brethren. It would be very difficult for any of us, on the part of the plaintiff, or all of us combined, to anticipate all that the counsel might be able to say upon that subject. We do not pretend to that ability. But we reason that, from the nature of the evidence, its legitimate and real import is to prove that, after the fact of this adultery was supposed to be ascertained, believed to be ascertained, between these parties, that then the relation in their domestic intercourse contradicted the possibility of any such event. Well, now, Sir, that does not depend upon the single isolated declaration which may have been made under the influence and sympathies which controlled the expression of the wife upon that particular occasion; but the fact whether or not the intercourse of these parties was inconsistent with the alleged adultery has to be traced by the whole course and history of their connection subsequent to that period, incompetent and inadmissible, it is true, but yet opened by the other side, and a course of interrogation pursued upon their part which leads to the one or the other result.

EVIDENCE OF DECLARATIONS BY MRS. TILTON.

Now, Sir, they are evidence, substantially in effect, of declarations on the part of Mrs. Tilton. Expressions of fondness and affection, if you please, and it is precisely the same as if Mrs. Tilton, being a competent witness, had been placed upon this stand and asked whether, after December, 1870, she had been in the habit, or had upon that particular occasion indulged in fondness of expression toward her husband. Suppose she was upon the stand making this very declaration of the contents of this letter, and we had asked her, in pursuit of the real object, "In your subsequent connection to this event with the plaintiff, what were the continuous relations that existed between you? Have you not, on other times, been unkind and unsympathetic? Have there not been occurrences between you and in your habitual intercourse which were consistent with the alleged adultery with the defendant?" Most obviously that could be shown. They produce here her written declaration, and we ask to contradict her by her written declaration made at another time, inconsistent with the exceptional one which they have introduced. Upon what principle would they be excluded? How else is this matter to be judged, except as being a declaration made upon the part of Mrs. Tilton toward that fact, which they seek to establish, of friendly and affectionate relation between herself and her husband after this event? It is not enough to prove that upon a single occasion she made these expressions of affection and manifested continued love for Mr. Tilton, and that they were made upon that particular occasion, with responding expressions. The question reaches continuously further than a single point of observation. We are to view their whole relation subsequent to the charge of adultery. We are to see whether in their constant, habitual intercourse there was no alienation, there was no cessation of those affections and those expressions of loving reverence which should have been maintained in the family, the fact of the adultery being absent. But, Sir, if this question, as I said, is to be considered as a mere matter of discretion, not as a matter of legal right—

COUNSEL URGES THE COURT TO EXERCISE PROPER DISCRETION.

I submit to you then that in the exercise of a proper discretion, with a view to the truth and justice of this inquiry with reference to the ascertainment of the fact whether the relations between those parties were of a character indicated by this single letter which they introduce. We offer to prove to you near the same time another letter from this lady containing a declaration of a certain character, which will have its proper effect, either sustaining or modifying that contained in the letter which they have introduced. I did not pursue, perhaps, sufficiently far the quotations from Mr. Phillips: "So, though character be not in issue, if the party introduce evidence to support his character—held, that for that reason the other party might give evidence in reply." It was incompetent evidence; one party had introduced it, and the court held that evidence in reply was therefore admissible. And it would be a strange doctrine, Sir, whether it is done by consent or under objection, if one party can give evidence of a particular character, attempt to establish a prominent and important issue in the case, that the other party might not give evidence of the same kind. Whether it be legal evidence or not is immaterial. The fact which they seek to establish by this letter is an important and controlling fact in the consideration of this case, reflecting upon the question of the charged adultery. I say, without endeavoring to anticipate the argument of counsel, that they will reason to the jury that this letter of Mrs. Tilton, this act, this expression of conduct upon her part, is utterly inconsistent with the idea that she could have been a criminal or a debased woman. You allow that, if this evidence is excluded, to stand upon a single proof of a single event, without giving to us the privilege of exposing the fallacy of that argument by producing other declarations from the same lady in regard to the same subject matter, and which may, to a greater or less extent, modify the effect of the proof they have offered. "Where the plaintiff offered evidence of the credibility of one of their witnesses, the defendants were allowed to ask another if the plaintiff's witness had not been guilty of larceny, not upon precisely the same subject—the testimony," say the court, "on both sides was illegal; but as the plaintiff resorted to that mode of supporting credibility, held—that they could not complain that it was repeated in the same way." I could read you numerous examples of the same character from this authority. I submit that, as a matter of right, this evidence is admissible; and, at least, as a matter of discretion, it is the duty of this court, as affirmed by these repeated authorities, to permit the evidence which is now offered. And I add simply that the objection to the exercise of discretion in that direction made from the inconvenience of allowing extended and prolonged examination by parol upon irrelevant questions, tends to the disturbance of the order and interruption of the business of the court and cannot apply here. We ask for no parol evidence upon the subject. I simply produce the letters written by the same hand, originating in the same mind and heart, expressing feelings and thoughts upon the same subject, and upon what principle of justice this should be excluded while the other is permitted to stand as against this plaintiff, I am at a loss to conceive.

MR. EVARTS THINKS IT A VERY SIMPLE QUESTION.

Mr. Evarts—I cannot think, if your Honor please, that the very simple question under the law of evidence presented for your solution demands very long inquiry. Whatever should induce length or variety of proposition concerning it must be to withdraw it from the rule of the decision, and not lead your Honor into it. The primary rules of evidence allow us, as they allowed the plaintiff, in the progress of this case, to introduce writing, because preceding either party, as the opposite party had occasion, and they also permitted either party to show the reception by the other party of communications from third persons and thereby to impute by affirmative connected evidence or by such conclusions as the law would draw from the reception to the response, such conclusions as came to the opposite party from thus receiving letters from third persons. The rule about husband and wife's inquiries anterior to the point of suspicion or discovery is wholly aside from that question. It terminates undoubtedly as by the very well-considered opinion in the Court of Queen's Bench in full Bench is settled upon the common-sense of the matter it would terminate upon the occasion of entertaining it not by a concealed act of adultery, but by the suspicion or disclosure, as the case may be, as to the actual or suspected thought, not the actual adultery.

Mr. Beach—Give us the reference.

Mr. Evarts—In the case of Trelawney vs. Coleman, 1 Barnew, and A. 90 (A. D. 1817

relations between husband and wife? A.—Not actual divorce, Sir.

Q.—I stated limited divorce? A.—I don't know of any such thing as limited divorce; there are separations, there are ordinary separations.

Q.—Very well; were you aware of the regulations of our law for desertion, cruelty, &c., in separating the parties, except from the obligation of their vow, so that they could not marry again? A.—I am quite aware, Sir, that parties can be separated for various reasons, but they cannot be divorced.

Q.—Well, do you know the difference between a limited and a divorce *a vinculo*? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Very well. Now, were you aware of the conditions of our law which limited a divorce *a vinculo* to adultery, and gave a divorce, a separation, limited, protecting the wife in other cases? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Very well. Now, Sir, was the State of Indiana one of those parts of the country where you thought right and liberality on the subject of divorce needed to be promulgated? A.—Will you be kind enough to ask that question again, Sir?

Mr. Evarts—It will be read to you.

A QUESTION WHICH THE WITNESS COULD NOT UNDERSTAND.

Stenographer—Now, Sir, was the State of Indiana one of those parts of the country where you thought right and liberality on the subject of divorce needed to be promulgated? A.—Well, Sir, I haven't got that in my mind yet, Mr. Evarts.

Mr. Evarts—Well, Sir, we will wait for you to turn it over in your mind.

Mr. Fullerton—Mr. Evarts had better get it out of his own mind properly first, before I can understand it.

Mr. Tilton—I desire to answer your question in good faith, Mr. Evarts, for I am under oath, and I can't answer until I understand you clearly.

Mr. Evarts—Well, I think it is very intelligible.

Mr. Tilton—It may be my fault, Sir.

Mr. Evarts—The question had better be read, Sir; I think it is very intelligible.

Mr. Tilton (to the stenographer)—Will you be kind enough to read it again?

Stenographer—"Now, Sir, was the State of Indiana one of those parts of the country where you thought right and liberality on the subject of divorce should be promulgated?" A.—Well, Sir, I can't say that I understand your question. I suppose that there is no State in the Union, nor is there any part of the world, where a public discussion affecting the interests of society is not pertinent and lawful.

Q.—I thought I understood you to say it was the differences between the law of New-York and that of the New-England States, and of the West, that constituted your interest and your doctrines on the subject of divorce? A.—That was exactly it, Sir.

Q.—Did you think then that the State of Indiana was one of the places where the presentation of your complaints against the State of New-York and the preference of the laws of the West were required as a matter of public reform? A.—Well, Sir, I can't speak for the State of Indiana. I still don't understand your question, Sir.

HIS LECTURE ON DIVORCE AND MARRIAGE.

Q.—Very well; that is a difficulty we cannot correct? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Did you write and deliver a lecture on the subject of divorce and marriage, and promulgate it during a Western tour? A.—No, Sir; I made the notes of a discourse on the subject which I gave in this State, and as it attracted a number of converts I was requested to repeat it at various points during my Western tour, to expose my views. Where I was requested to do it I did it. I didn't thrust my lecture upon anybody.

Q.—In what place in New-York State did you deliver that lecture? A.—Cornell University, by the invitation of the authorities.

Q.—Any where else? A.—Well, I should have to look at a list. Yes, Sir; I think I delivered it at a number of places.

Q.—Delivered it where? A.—Well, I can't say.

Q.—You can't remember any place? A.—I can't at this moment. I remember I opened a lecture course there by invitation of the college students, and as there had been very much comment upon my supposed lecture views, I think I delivered it.

Q.—I only asked you where you delivered it, nothing else. Now, Sir, did you deliver that lecture at Bloomington, Indiana? A.—I did, Sir; that is to say, I delivered a discourse there.

Q.—Before the Seminary there? A.—Before the University.

Q.—Did you in that lecture announce this proposition: "If any two among them have promised each other enduring love, they were in fact as much man and wife in the eyes of heaven as if the sanction of the law and the benediction of the priest had pronounced them so?" A.—I did not, Sir.

Q.—Did you in this lecture tell your hearers —at Bloomington I am now speaking of—"to follow nature and obey the impulses?" A.—No such phrase in my lecture, Sir.

Q.—No sentiment of that kind? A.—Nothing of the kind, Sir.

Q.—Did you in that lecture denounce the interference of either Church or State with marriage? A.—I did not, Sir. I criticised certain relations on the part of the State to divorce and marriage.

Q.—Did you in that lecture say, in this connection on the subject of your lecture of divorce and marriage, that if you had your way you would crush the Church? A.—I did not.

Q.—Did you as a part of your lecture say that "In this free and unrestrained commerce between the sexes there might be a good many babies born into the world, but they would have to be taken care of by the State?" A.—I did not, Sir.

Q.—And that "It would be the duty of the State to regulate prostitution?" A.—No, Sir.

HIS EARLY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

Q.—Now, you have stated, Mr. Tilton, in reference to some expressions of your correspondence, classified to the questions put to you, that your early religious education pronuced a resonance and echo in your mind that would account for these expressions of self-depreciation or of gloom. You remember that inquiry? A.—I remember it: yes, Sir.

Q.—You remember it distinctly? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Now, Sir, had you not also, as a part of this early education, been taught a strict morality as well as these severe doctrines of theology? A.—I had, Sir.

Q.—You gave us an instance that you would rather have cut off your hand than have written a letter on Sunday—something of that kind? A.—In these early days, yes, Sir.

Q.—Now, before the dates of these letters you had very thoroughly got over that feeling regarding the sanctity of the Sabbath, had you not? A.—Yes, Sir—no, not of the Sabbath, but of the severe rigidity and moral duties.

Q.—Those feelings regarding the sanctity of the Sabbath that you referred to? A.—Yes, Sir. I joined Plymouth Church in 1853, and an entire new system of religious thought was taught to me.

Q.—Now, I only asked you the single question whether you had not got over these notions that you then referred to and gave the instance of—that you got over those thoughts at the time you wrote these letters of which you were inquired of? A.—Mr. Evarts, I have not got entirely over those thought yet, and when I spoke or used some words which you appear to have just now quoted, namely, the resonants and reverberations of the old thoughts in my mind, they are the signs and tokens that they still linger with me. I have never been able to throw them off entirely.

Q.—Now, Sir, what effect upon your feelings and their expression in the phrases of degradation and reproach which you used in these letters would be produced by the reverberation of your early teaching, if your conduct had not changed on those subjects? A.—I don't know that my conduct has changed on those subjects; it was the spontaneous impulse of a man brought up as I was brought up in my early years to confess himself before God abjectly and wretchedly a sinner, and though I departed afterward under the teachings of Plymouth Church from that view of human nature as under the rod and discipline of the divine, still, in all hours of weakness and worryings, the earlier views come back, and the terrible standards come down, and I am beaten with the rod and crushed again into the earth.

Q.—Yes; and you think, then, on the occasions of these letters in evidence that these were written with these expressions connecting themselves with these earlier doctrines of original sin and the five points of Calvinism, and did you to your own conduct refer in those letters? A.—No, Mr. Evarts; every one of those letters refers to to my own conduct, and as falling short of the standard of conduct which God reveals to man, and which all men should follow, namely, unselfishness, kindliness, diligence to the wants of others, tenderheartedness, freedom from all malice; and whenever I compared myself with those standards, and brought my early education and the scourge which old Dr. Alexander put upon us to do our best, I was always ashamed of myself; I think any honest man is.

Q.—Then you think the requirements of this religious education operating upon your mind were applied by you in your letters to your actual conduct as it was present in your recollection? A.—Yes, Sir; for instance, Mr. Evarts, if you want me to, I will give you an illustration.

PAYMENT OF THE BOWEN AWARD.

Q.—No matter about me, Sir. I don't want any illustration. You have stated in answer to a direct question that the payment of the $7,000 had nothing to do with the tripartite agreement? A.—Nothing at all, Sir.

Q.—And that it was paid to you, I think, before it was signed? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—What day did you sign? A.—I don't remember the day, but it was two or three days afterward; two or three days after the payment. The $7,000 was paid to me in April by a check by Mr. Bowen, on the very night of the arbitration.

Q.—The 2d of April? A.—I think it was the 2d of April; I don't know the date of that arbitration further than what it has been generally accepted to be; I have no means of identifying that day. It has been said that it was the 2d of April, 1872; whether it was so I cannot say.

Q. (Check handed witness.)—Now, Sir, will you look at that and say if that is the check you received? A.—That is the check, Sir.

Q.—What is the date of it? A.—April 4.

Mr. Evarts—Have that marked as an exhibit.

Mr. Tilton—I carried that check to Franklin Woodruff, and he scolded me for bringing it so late. He said I never would be a rich man, because I let the pennies go to waste because I had lost a day's interest.

Q.—As it was deposited on the 5th, you did not loose much.

Mr. Tilton—I did not say the check was dated on the evening of the 4th, I say the check is dated that—

Mr. Evarts—Never mind, the check speaks for itself as to its date.

A.—It was deposited with Woodruff & Robinson on the 5th of April, as you will see by the account. Mr. Woodruff made a remark about my losing a day's interest by my being a careless man.

Mr. Evarts—I read the check.

NEW-YORK, April 4, 1874.
Pay to the order of Theodore Tilton $7,000.
HENRY C. BOWEN.

On the back:
Pay to the order of Wocdruff & Robinson.
THEODORE TILTON.

Indorsed—Woodruff & Robinson. Check D, 108:

Q.—Now you say you entertained no doubt that Mr. Bowen owed you the $7,000? A.—I have said that, Sir, over and over again. Mr. Bowen owed me the $7,000, and paid me because he owed it, and for no other reason.

Mr. Evarts—I ask to have the last part of the answer struck out, as it is not responsive to my question.

Judge Neilson—Very well.

Mr. Evarts—Now, Sir, do you think you were entitled to those damages, if Mr. Bowen had a justifiable cause for dismissing you from his employment? A.—Mr. Bowen had no justifiable cause.

Q.—Just answer my question, if you please. A.—What is your question.

Mr Evarts—I ask to strike out this answer. My question is a very simple one. Do you think that Mr. Bowen owed you these damages if he had a justifiable cause for dismissing you from his employment?

Mr. Beach—One moment; that calls, Sir, for what he thought at that time, and the witness says he had no justifiable cause.

Judge Neilson—I think he had better understand the question; he might have thought so.

Mr. Beach—Then they are taking his admission.

Mr. Evarts—We ask him for his admission whether Mr. Bowen owed him that.

Judge Neilson—I think he may answer.

Mr. Evarts—Do you think Mr. Bowen owed you these damages if he had a justifiable cause for dismissing you from his employment? A.—No such thought ever arose in my mind, because there was nothing on which to frame that; I never thought of such an idea until it was suggested by your lips.

Q.—You never heard from Mr. Bowen a discussion concerning the stories that he had heard to your prejudice antecedent to the breaking of the contract? A.—I never had a word with Mr. Bowen on that subject except in the interview of Dec. 26, 1870; I never saw Mr. Bowen after that until April 2 or 3, whatever may be the date, 1872, and I have never seen him since except to meet him occasionally on the ferryboat.

Q.—You did see him since? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—And that interview has been detailed? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Now, Sir, was not the subject of the stories against you present and discussed between you and Mr. Bowen? A.—Yes, Sir; I have stated that most distinctly.

Q.—Well, Sir, you think you held that interview upon the suggestion of your friend Mr. Johnson, that it would be useful for you to do so? A.—Yes, Sir; I have stated that I held it at my own impulse; I heard that Mr. Bowen had heard tales about me from somebody, and Mr. Johnson brought me that information, and I said "I will see Mr. Bowen at once."

Q.—That was in consequence of Mr. Johnson bringing these stories to you and telling you about them? A.—Yes, Sir, I thought the right thing to do was to meet Mr. Bowen face to face on the spot.

THE FRENCH COMMUNE.

Q.—Now, Sir, when did the Commune of France come to an end? A.—Well that is a point of history which I should not like to pluck out of my memory and hand it over to you. I should have to refer to the contemporaneous history of the time. It went down in blood.

Q.—Well, it was some time antecedent to this procession of yours, wasn't it—or in which you took part? A.—Why, it went down a long while ago. The Commune, considered as a mere political organization, a mere shell, lasted only a little while.

Q.—Well, it had come to an end before this procession in which you took a part? A.—Why, I think it had, a long time before.

Q.—But it did not last very long, anyway, did it? A.—No, Sir, the mere exterior organization. The principle which animated it—

Mr. Evarts—Oh, the principle!

The Witness—And theory, they will live as long as Thomas Jefferson's system of American republicanism.

Q.—Yes; and very likely the principles which you have announced here to-day had an origin before Thomas Jefferson. A.—I think they had —yes.

Mr. Evarts—And will last a great while, I dare say.

THE WINSTED YOUNG LADY.

Q.—Now, you have been asked in regard to this young person that went to Winsted. Do you know how old that young lady was? A.—No. I stated this morning that she was a schoolgirl at that time, I should say sixteen or seventeen years old.

Q.—You speak of her, in your letter that was read, as a "mere child?" A.—Well, that was years ago; that was 1868.

Q.—Well, I have nothing to say about it, only call your attention to it. A.—I don't know how old she was.

Q.—No? A.—She was a friend and companion of my daughter Florence. I do not know whether they were of equal age or not. I think she was older—perhaps several years older.

Q.—Don't you know, or can't you say, upon consideration, that she was as much as nineteen years old? A.—I do not, Sir, at all.

Q.—Was not she a large person? A.—Not very large.

Q.—She was not diminutive? A.—No, she was a fair-sized girl, neither large nor small.

HIS VISITS TO MRS. WOODHULL'S.

Q.—You have said that on your visits to Mrs. Woodhull's house, her "husband" was present. Do you mean by that the gentleman called Col. Blood in the evidence? A.—Yes, Sir.

WHAT HE FOUND IN THE CLOSET.

Q.—Now, Mr. Tilton, you have spoken about a closet in which you found, in your own house, a variety of things. Do you know how many portraits there were of other persons that were in that closet? A.—There was no portrait of anybody else.

Q.—In the way of photographs? A.—No portrait of anybody else at all.

Q.—Do you know how many there were in the drawers—the bureau drawers—of that room of other persons? A.—There were not any.

Q.—Did you send away from your house a quantity of portraits or photographs of other persons? A.—No, Sir.

Q.—Afterward? A.—No, Sir.

Q.—Did you send them to your wife? A.—I did not.

Q.—Well; were they sent from that house, do you know? A.—Not that I know of; I never heard of any such thing.

Q.—Don't you know that there were altogether some seventy or eighty photographs of persons; I do not say of so many different persons, but of persons other than Mr. Beecher, that were in your wife's possession there? A.—No, Sir; never heard of any such thing; I have got a little collection of my own of photographic cards of distinguished people, perhaps 150, but they do not belong to her; they belong to me; as far as I know they are still in the house.

Q.—Did not Mrs. Tilton have seven or eight photographs of Rev. Dr. Taylor, of New-York? A.—I never saw them, if she had.

Q.—Hadn't she several of Mr. Greeley? A.—I never saw them.

Q.—Hadn't she quite a number of Rev. Dr. Storrs? A.—I never saw them.

Q.—Now, Sir, did you give her any of these photographs of Mr. Beecher? A.—No, Sir; never one.

Q.—Did you never give her a photograph of Mr. Beecher? A.—No, Sir; not that I remember.

Q.—Well, are you sure that you never gave her any? A.—I do not remember that I ever had one. Mr. Beecher once gave me a photograph of himself, a large one, that hung on the wall eight or ten years ago. I do not remember any other photograph.

Q.—And in the whole course, then, of your friendship with Mr. Beecher you never had a photograph of his except this one that you now refer to, that you remember? A.—Oh, I do not remember about the early years; I think quite likely I may have had photographs of his.

Q.—Yes. Do you remember whether during those years of past friendships you gave any photographs of Mr. Beecher to your wife? A.—No, I do not.

Q.—You may have done so? A.—Oh, I gave her everything I got. If I had it, quite likely I gave it to her.

Q.—Did you have any considerable number of Mr. Beecher's photographs yourself? A.—No, Sir.

Q.—From which you gave to other persons? A.—No, Sir, not that I remember.

Q.—Not that you remember? Then I want to know whether you will say that you never had them. A.—I never had, Sir.

Q.—And never gave photographs of Mr Beecher to other friends of yours? A.—Well, I don't remember; I may have done so years and years ago.

Q.—Nothing that is within your memory? A.—No.

Q.—Now, Sir, there is a little picture here that is made an exhibit. Do you know to whom that belonged? A.—I never saw it until it was passed over to the jury. I did not know it was in the box. I did not myself detect it in the box. I have not since seen it.

Q.—Did you know of its belonging to one of your younger children, having been picked up in the street? A.—I know nothing about it other than that I found it in that box; or if it was found in the box which I brought here, I think it was found by Mr. Fullerton since he came in court.

Q.—Now, Sir, in this closet that you have spoken of, do you know when the things that you there found were put there? A.—I know nothing about it; I only know that I found them; that is all.

Q.—That is all you know? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—Now, was there anything in the way of gifts to Mrs. Tilton that you found in that closet that you were not aware of before? A.—I was not aware of any of them that I found.

Q.—You were not aware of any presents of books to Mrs. Tilton? A.—No, Sir, other than this; I remember once that he gave her a copy of "Life Thoughts." I think, and that he gave her a copy of "Norwood," and me one; but I was not aware of this great collection of books that I found in the closet, and which were inscribed by him to her; that I had never seen.

Q.—You spoke of it as a great collection? A.—Well, Sir, it made a shelf full about that long. [Illustrating by holding the hands two or three feet apart.]

Q.—Now, what were the books? A.—They were mainly his writings—his various publications.

Q.—Many copies of the same book? A.—No, Sir; no copies of the same book.

Q.—Separate books? A.—Yes, Sir, separate books.

Q.—And his own works? A.—Yes, Sir, mainly his own works.

Q.—And his gifts to your wife, as appeared from the title page or the inscriptions on some of them? A.—Yes, Sir. The only way I knew they were gifts by him to Mrs. Tilton is the fact that the books or, being opened contained on the white leaf, "Presented to Mrs. Elizabeth R. Tilton by her friend, Henry Ward Beecher," or something of that kind; various inscriptions in the various books.

Q.—Well, what sized books were they? A.—What "sized" books?

Q.—Yes, sized? A.—Well, octavo books, generally, if you know that size.

Mr. Evarts [comically]—Yes, *I* know it; *I* know all sizes. [Laughter.] They were octavo?

The Witness—Most of them, I think; constituting in the main the series of his publications which have been made from time to time.

Q.—Exactly. A.—Quite large; the books are not so big as law-books; still—

Q.—Oh, "octavo" is near enough for my comprehension. Now, did you happen to be aware, among your acquaintances in Brooklyn, that Mr. Beecher had made presents of his books to others of his parishioners? A.—No, Sir; I have been told, on the contrary, that Mr. Beecher very seldom shows any courtesy to any of his parishioners; seldom visits them, or attends their funerals, or makes them presents of any kind. [Laughter.]

Mr. Evarts—I ask to have that all struck out.

The Court—Yes.

[Another ripple of laughter swept over the court-room.]

Mr. Beach—Why didn't you stop it?

Mr. Evarts—How could I stop it?

Mr. Beach—By saying a word.

The Court (to the counsel)—One moment. (To the audience)—I have no doubt that to-morrow I shall be able to fix my eye upon some gentleman—if he is a gentleman—and have an officer remove him from this court. I made an appeal to you this morning on this subject. I said a week ago that I would not sit here and try to administer justice in the midst of such interruptions. It is an insult and an abuse. (To the counsel)—That is stricken out; repeat your question and get the short answer that you are entitled to.

Mr. Evarts—I have got the answer that he was not aware of it; the rest is struck out.

Q.—Now, Sir, have you a sufficient acquaintance with the interior arrangements of the house and the disposal of these books and pictures to know that all these gifts of Mr. Beecher were openly about in the different rooms of the house until your wife had occasion to take boarders, and in making arrangements for their accommodation they were packed into this closet. A.—I know nothing about it, Sir. I never saw those gifts until I found them after her departure. They were never lying around the house.

Q.—When was this period at which your wife resorted to keeping boarders?

Mr. Fullerton—That is new matter, Sir, and I object to it.

Mr. Evarts—It is bearing on the question.

The Court—There is a good deal of new matter, but still, I think we will take it.

Mr. Evarts—It is not new matter in any other sense than fixing this fact.

The Witness—I do not know how long ago it was, but she came to me one day—

Mr. Evarts—No matter about that.

The Court—You do not know how long ago it was? A.—No; I cannot fix the date.

Mr. Evarts—Can you give it within a year or two? A.—I think it was after the publication of the Woodhull scandal. She wanted to live alone and carry on the house.

Q.—She began to take boarders after the publication of the Woodhull scandal? A.—I think she did—yes, Sir; still, I won't be positive as to the date.

Q.—Now, Sir, these presents you have no recollection of seeing about the house up to that time, and of their being displaced with reference to the arrangements for boarders? A.—No, Sir; I never saw them there. There was a gift of a picture—one or two pictures—made years ago, I knew about. I never knew anything about the books.

Q.—Do you remember receiving the key to this closet from your wife? A.—No, Sir. I have not seen my wife since she left her house in July, except so far as I have seen her at a distance in the court-room.

Q.—Well, I understand. But it might be sent to you, might it not, and received by you at your house? A.—I know nothing of that.

Q.—And the key never was received, to your knowledge, at your house? A.—I do not know that the key was ever taken away. When I made a search through the house I asked my housekeeper for the keys, and she gave me the keys of various closets, and this one among them. I do not know where she got it.

Q.—That is your recollection of the affair, is it? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—And did you open it with the key? A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—And you know nothing of the key being sent from your wife? A.—No, Sir.

Q.—Now, at your wife's last confinement, Mr. Tilton, you were about the house, were you not? A.—Yes, Sir.

THE PRESENTS OF FLOWERS.

Q.—Did you know of these presents of flowers that were made to your wife in her illness? A.—We have always had flowers in the house. Sometimes I ordered them; sometimes she did. I knew that occasionally Mr. Beecher had sent her flowers.

Q.—Did you know who brought flowers from Mr. Beecher's place to your house a few days after the child was born? A.—I do not remember.

Q.—Do you know of Capt. Duncan's bringing them there? A.—I do not. It is the first I have ever heard of that.

Q.—Do you remember being at home when Mr. Beecher called on your wife during this confinement, and there seeing and receiving him? A.—No, Sir; I have no recollection of that.

Q.—Do you remember other gentlemen friends calling upon your wife during that confinement, and you seeing them there? A.—I do not recall it, Sir; it is four or five years ago.

Q.—Do you know of Mr. Beecher's being there and in her room, in the same way that the witness testified to about Mr. Beecher? A.—I do not remember any such thing; I never heard of it.

Q.—Do you know that Mrs. Mitchell, the monthly nurse, was there during all this time? A.—I know that she was the nurse.

Q.—And do you know that she was in the room with your wife while Mr. Beecher was there in the room? A.—I did not know anything about Mr. Beecher being in the room there until I heard it from this stand here yesterday, in the person of the wet-nurse.

Q.—Do you remember that you were in the house at the time that Mr. Beecher called, at this September visit that this servant has testified about? A.—No, Sir. I never heard of it until I heard of it yesterday.

Q.—That is to say, that you never heard of this occurrence until you heard it yesterday? A.—No, Sir.

Q.—But do you remember being there on a day when an Equal Rights Committee met there, and that Mr. Beecher called on that day? A.—The Equal Rights Committee, under Mrs. Tilton's invitation, met at my house, I suppose, forty times.

Q.—Yes? A.—I don't remember any special occasion when he was there.

Q.—Do you remember that on this day in September there was a meeting of that committee there, and you were in the house—I do not say that you were a member of the committee, for I dare say they were all ladies—and knew what that meeting was, that month? A.—Knew of what meeting?

Q.—The meeting of this Equal Rights Committee on this day in December on which Mr. Beecher called? A.—Oh, I cannot single out any particular meeting of the Equal Rights Committee at my house. It met there, my impression is, once a week or once a fortnight. It met there frequently. I was not always present; Mrs. Tilton conducted the exercises.

Q.—Did you—

[Mr. Evarts here turned and consulted with Mr. Shearman.]

The Witness—I say exercises; I mean the arrangements.

Mr. Evarts—Now, don't you remember Mr. Bates' calling there immediately after your wife's confinement, and seeing her in her room—in the end of June—more than once? A.—I have no recollection of it, Sir, at all. Sir.

Q.—Have you a recollection of his being there on Sunday, the 22d of June? A.—No, Sir.

Q.—And you and he going off to Coney Island together? A.—No, Sir.

Q.—No recollection of anything of the kind? A.—I cannot fix the date of any such event; it is a long time ago; Mr. Bates was a near neighbor, living around the corner.

Q.—An intimate friend? A.—A dear friend, and ran in occasionally.

ARTICLE SIX OF HIS SWORN STATEMENT.

Mr. Evarts—There are some letters. Your Honor will remember that article 6, of what is called the sworn statement, was allowed to be put in evidence on the part of the plaintiff, was not it? (turning to Mr. Fullerton.)

Mr. Fullerton—Yes.

Mr. Evarts (showing book to witness)—Now, was this article 6, as put in evidence, written by you?

The Witness—Was it written by me?

Mr. Evarts—Yes; composed by you?

The Witness—The entire statement was composed by me.

Mr. Evarts—I am not asking you about anything but that. Was that written by you? A.—It certainly was.

Q.—From beginning to end? A.—Except so far as Mrs. Tilton's quotation.

Q.—Well, that was written with your pen? A.—No, Sir.

Q.—That quotation was made a part of that article by you as its composer? A.—Yes, Sir.

Mr. Evarts, (turning to Mr. Shearman)—Now, these "Bowen's heads of difficulties." [Mr. Evarts then held a few minutes conversation with his associate.]

FURTHER LETTERS FROM MRS. TILTON TO HER HUSBAND.

Mr. Shearman—If your Honor please, I now read two letters from Mrs. Tilton to her husband.

Mr. Fullerton—What date?

Mr. Shearman—Aug. 15, 1869, and Sept. 4 of the same year. Mrs. Tilton to her husband.

Mr. Fullerton—Let me see them.

[The letters were handed to counsel for examination.]

Mr. Beach—This raises the question, Sir, of whether your Honor's decision excluding our letter of 1872 is not applied to these during August and September, 1869.

Mr. Evarts—Why, there is no trouble about that, I take it. There is no ruling on that subject that I know of. This is not anterior to the suspicion or discovery.

Judge Neilson—What is the date?

Mr. Evarts—1869, the Monticello time. It is offered in consequence of this evidence given yesterday, and my friends have introduced two letters here to-day; you introduced other letters in connection with this period. But it is not important; we will not discuss it.

Mr. Beach—We only showed the letters to the witness to refresh his mind.

Judge Neilson—Are they two distinct letters, or are they part of the correspondence?

Mr. Evarts—They are two letters, on the 15th of August and the 4th of September.

Judge Neilson—Of the same year?

Mr. Evarts—Yes, Sir.

Judge Neilson—Well, read them.

Mr. Evarts—They are from Monticello, and there are several in evidence.

Mr. Shearman then read the following:

MONTICELLO, Aug. 15, 1869—Sunday.

MY DEAR HUSBAND: These days are full of memories of the sickness and sufferings of little Paul, a year ago. Our other darling is full of promise in the *future*—but the present—while he grows finely all waking hours as well as sleeping, restless and crying with colic, I feel sure that he will be healthy, his lungs are strong enough for a public speaker already. When I settled my board bill I had a long talk with the Doctor, of my discontent and disappointment, and as I had said to Sally that I would use my fascinations and Christian charity to work a change for our mutual good, and so it proved. I drew out his best, and there appeared the *gentle man*; since when we have had good roast beef, been urged to take another piece, and a bountiful supply generally. In this you will rejoice with me. No reply yet from my Cornwall letter. Of course I shall not remain here. The scales say I have gained four pounds, notwithstanding poor food and care of baby and children. I think with longing of our seventy-five easy chairs when my poor back tires—bolt upright. Then I look up to the *hills*, from whence cometh my rest. I rejoice that at last you feel "the pleasantest place I know of is this house." So may it ever be. I missed my newspapers this week. * * * Mr. Beecher wrote me a very summery, characteristic letter, which I would inclose save for the fear you would lose it.

I very much desire you should bring from Mr. Page the plaster cast of little Paul and lay it in the bureau drawer among my treasures.

Did you have a visit from Sallie Lovejoy, and did she enjoy our pretty house? Tell me about it. To-day is our first.

Mr. Shearman—The letter breaks off here; it is incomplete. Of course, we read all we have of it.

Mr. Shearman then read the following letter, saying that there was no doubt that it was written in 1869, although the year was not designated:

MONTICELLO, Sept. 4—Monday Evening.

MY DEAR HUSBAND: Bella is sitting with me, the children asleep, and I have just finished reading your letter describing Mrs. T——'s funeral exercises. I feel very deeply for that young widow. Poor woman, I cannot bear to think of her dreadful loss. It unnerves me. Oh, my darling, may we not once more have a home of our own, where we may live our short lives together? You speak of coming up for next Sunday meeting. If so, do prepare to spend the remaining two weeks with me, that we may return together. You can write your editorials here, and the rest you need after this last week's excitement.

Mr. Davison wished me to ask you if you could procure for him the large colored picture used for illustrations in the infant class of Plymouth Sunday-school, also any other apparatus that you think would be useful for that department. Mr. Huntington would help you, darling, in selecting them.

Bella leaves by to-morrow's coach. I was very glad to see her. We had a ride this afternoon, and yesterday we strolled in the fields; but I could not say, as the Sabbath before I did, I was perfectly happy, or as happy as any one could be in this world, for you were absent, and on so melancholy a mission!

Darling, do not forget to bring plenty of money, that we may get through with our visit here safely.

I have felt my first homesickness this week—that is, a desire to be back among the dear old places. I have gained only one pound the last week. We sat for our pictures to-day, but, I fear, with poor success.

The children are well and happy. Excuse this wretchedly hurried letter, as I want to send it by the early mail. We look for Emma to-morrow, Tuesday. Clarence is well and has been well.

Love to dear mother and Joe.

Yours always, WIFEY.

Mr. Shearman—Will you say who "Bella" is? A.—Miss Isabella Oakley, a former teacher of our children.

WHEN DID MRS. TILTON RETURN FROM MONTICELLO.

Mr. Evarts—Do you know how soon after this letter of Sept. 4, in Monticello, Mrs. Tilton returned to Brooklyn? A.—I could not say, out of mere memory.

Mr. Beach—She speaks of your remaining two weeks on the visit, in the letter.

Mr. Evarts—You do not recall whether you went up there to spend two weeks? A.—I don't recall that particular occasion. I have been to Monticello. I made an address there.

Q.—You cannot assist us in determining how soon after the 4th of September she returned, or whether she returned as soon, or sooner, than she expected? A.—No, Sir. There is nothing in my remembrance that I would like to give the date.

BOWEN'S HEADS OF DIFFICULTY.

Mr. Evarts—We called for a memorandum, something that is called "Heads of Difficulty," but it could not be found and produced at that time; it is now produced. It was produced at some other period, and was marked "D 107," but then it was incomplete. It was not found until our friends commenced their redirect, and I now offer it in evidence.

Mr. Fullerton—We object to it.

Mr. Beach—It is immaterial and incompetent as between Mr. Beecher and Mr. Bowen. We have nothing to do with that.

Mr. Evarts—Well, we will look at that in the morning. It is not anything that requires the presence of the witness.

The Court—Well, are you through with the witness now.

Mr. Evarts—Yes.

The Court—Your redirect closes here?

Mr. Evarts—Our recross closes here.

The Court—Yes, your recross.

Mr. Fullerton—This letter of March 24, 1868, we may offer ourselves.

The Court—Now, do you intend to interrogate the witness, Mr. Fullerton?

Mr. Beach (to the witness)—Is that a letter you wrote your wife? [Handing a letter to the witness.] A.—Yes, Sir.

Q.—At the time of its date? A.—Yes, Sir.

[This letter was marked for identification.]

Counsel was proceeding to put a further question when it was announced that one of the jurors was ill, and the court therefore adjourned until this morning, and directed the court officer, Mr. Spaulding, to accompany the juror to his residence.

## FINANCIAL AFFAIRS.

SALES AT THE STOCK EXCHANGE—FEB. 17.

SALES BEFORE THE CALL—10 A. M.

1400 Western Union. 71⅛ 100 Rock Island...s3. 103⅞
300 do.....c. 71⅛ 400 do..... 103¾
2800 do.....c. 71⅝ 200 do..... 103¾
300 do.....c. 71⅜ 200 do..... 103⅞
800 do..... 71⅝ 100 do..... 104
600 do..... 71⅝ 300 Del., L. & W. b.c. 109⅛
500 do..... 71⅜ 400 O. & Miss. b.c. 25
200 do.....b3. 71⅜ 600 do..... 25⅛
500 do.....s3. 71⅝ 100 do..... 25⅜
1400 do..... 71½ 200 do.....s3. 25¼
1800 do..... 71⅝ 300 do.....s60. 25
100 United States Ex. 69 600 do..... 25⅜
3500 L.S.&M.S. b.c.s3. 73 1400 do.....s60. 24⅞
2700 do..... 73 600 do..... 25¼
100 do.....b4. 72⅞ 500 do.....s3. 25¼
400 do.....b3. 73 400 do..... 25⅜
1000 do.....s3. 73⅛ 100 do..... 25¼
200 do.....c. 73⅜ 500 Han. & St. Jo. b.c. 21
100 Pac. R. of Mo. b.c. 45 100 C., C. & I. C. b.c. 5⅝
300 At. & Pac. Pf. b.c. 13

SALES FROM 2:30 TO 3 P. M.

$17,000 U. Pac. S. F., 8s 88⅜ 10 N. J. Central.....103¼
7 Del. & Hudson....113⅜ 700 Lake Shore..... 74
100 Quicksilver..... 33½ 200 do.....s3. 73
500 N. Y. C. & H...b3. 101¼ 2700 do..... 72⅞
100 Erie Railway..... 27⅜ 400 do.....b3. 73
100 do..... 27½ 800 Union Pacific..... 39⅝
600 do..... 27⅝ 500 do.....b3. 39¾
100 Western Union.... 71½ 200 do.....s3. 39⅝
700 do..... 71⅜ 300 do..... 39⅜
100 do..... 71¼ 100 Rock Island.....103⅜
900 do.....s3. 71¼ 2700 North-western. 42½
11 do..... 71 100 do.....s3. 42½
400 do..... 71¼ 900 do..... 42⅜
1100 do..... 71⅜ 900 do..... 42¼
200 do.....s3. 71⅜ 1000 do..... 42⅛
1400 do..... 71 1000 do..... 42¼
200 do.....s3. 71 200 do.....s3. 42⅜
100 do.....b3. 71 400 do.....b3. 42½
1300 do.....s3. 70⅞ 100 North-western Pf. 55⅛
900 do..... 71 300 Toledo & Wab.... 19¼
600 do.....s3. 70¾ 120 do..... 19⅝
200 do..... 70⅝ 1300 do..... 19¾
2300 do..... 70⅞ 500 do..... 19⅝
200 St. Paul..... 34⅛ 2200 do..... 19¾
300 do.....s3. 73⅛ 500 do..... 19⅝
600 do..... 73 700 do..... 19¾
200 do..... 73⅛ 1000 do..... 19⅝
200 do.....b3. 73⅛ 400 do..... 19¾
100 do..... 73 1100 do..... 19⅝
200 do..... 73⅛ 1000 do..... 19¾
4800 Lake Shore..... 72⅞ 500 do..... 10
600 do.....b3. 73 300 do..... 10⅛
1000 do.....s3. 73 700 St. Paul..... 34⅛
2700 do.....c. 72⅞ 100 do.....b3. 34¼
7500 do..... 72⅞ 300 do..... 34⅝
200 do.....c. 72⅝ 100 do..... 34⅝
200 do.....s10. 72⅞ 3300 do..... 34⅜
6500 do..... 72⅞ 1400 Ohio & Miss..... 25⅞
2500 do..... 73 2100 do..... 26
1000 do..... 73⅛ 100 do.....c. 25⅞
100 Panama..... 111½ 500 do..... 25⅞

GOVERNMENT STOCKS—10:15 AND 11:30 A. M.

$10,000 U. S. 6s, '81, R. 119 $1,000 do.....b.c. 119½
2,000 U. S. 5-20 R., '64. 117⅞ 50,000 do.....s. 119½
10,000 U. S. 5-20 R., '65.....119 50,000 do.....b.c. 12.115
10,000 U. S. 5s, 10-40 20,000 do.....b.c. s3.115
C.....117 7,000 U. S. 6s, C..... 119½
1,000 do.....117⅛ 9,000 C.....119⅝
11,000 U. S. 5-20 C., 1,000 U. S. 5-20 C.,
'67.....119⅝ '68.....12.119⅝

FIRST BOARD—10:30 A. M.

$10,000 Tenn. 6s, n., ex coup..... 45½ 51 Marine Bank.....130
5,000 N.Y.St.B.L. R. 106½ 200 Mariposa L. & Mg. Co., b. c.s3. 5
5,000 C. & R.I. & P. 7s. 107¼ 100 Wells-Fargo E. b.c. 87
11,000 C. & N.W. Con. 90 30 American Ex. b.c. 63⅜
1,000 C. & N.W. 1st. 98½ 15 Mich. Cen...b.c. 73½
1,000 Mor. & E. 7s. 71.105 9 do..... 74
8,000 Ill. & St. Jo. 8s, Conv..... 84 100 do..... 75
5,000 Long Dock B. 102 3000 L. S. & M. S. b.c. 73⅛
7,000 Mich. So. 2d...102 1300 do.....c. 73¼
2,000 Am. D. I. Co. 7s. 100½ 1300 do..... 73⅜
1,000 Det. M. & T. 1st. 93¼ 500 do..... 73⅝
5,000 M. & St. P. 1st Con. Coup. 88 2200 do..... 73¾
2,000 O. & M. Con. S. F. 99⅞ 500 do.....s3. 73⅝
5,000 P. R. of Mo. 1st. 89½ 700 do.....c. 73¼
8,000 C. C. & I. C. 1st. 63 1000 do..... 73½
2,000 U. P. 1st. b. c. 

# The New York Times.

WITH SUPPLEMENT.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, FEB. 18, 1875.


*AMUSEMENTS THIS EVENING.*

BOOTH'S THEATRE.—HENRY V.—Mr. George Reynold, Mr. Frederick Thorne, Mr. Charles Calvert, Miss Bertha Girardin.

WALLACK'S THEATRE.—THE SHAUGHRAUN—Mr. J. B. Montague, Mr. Dion Boucicault, Miss Ada Dyas.

UNION SQUARE THEATRE.—THE TWO ORPHANS—Mr. John Parselle, Mr. C. R. Thorne, Jr., Miss Fanny Morant, Miss Kate Claxton.

FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE.—THE BIG BONANZA—Mr. Charles Fisher, Mr. James Lewis, Mr. W. Davidge, Miss Fanny Davenport.

PARK THEATRE.—GIROFLE-GIROFLA (Opera Bouffe)—Mlle. Minetti, Mlle. Dorel, M. Duplan.

LYCEUM THEATRE.—OFF THE LINE—THE DODGER.—Mr. J. L. Toole.

BARNUM'S ROMAN HIPPODROME.—EQUESTRIANISM, ATHLETICS—MENAGERIE—MUSEUM—Open afternoon and evening.

OLYMPIC THEATRE.—VAUDEVILLE AND VARIETY ENTERTAINMENT.

BOWERY THEATRE.—WEALTH AND CRIME.—Mr. A. H. Sheldon, Theodore Loyal.

WOOD'S MUSEUM.—DRAMATIC PERFORMANCE—CURIOSITIES—Afternoon and evening.

ROBINSON HALL.—PERSONATION AND SONGS by Mr. Frederic Maccabe.

COLOSSEUM.—CYCLORAMA OF PARIS BY NIGHT—OPERETTAS—SKETCHES.

BRYANT'S OPERA HOUSE.—MINSTRELSY—NEGRO DELINEATIONS, &c.—Mr. Bryant, Mr. Emerson.

SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS.—MINSTRELSY and NEGRO COMICALITIES—Messrs. Birch, Wambold, and Backus.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF DESIGN.—EXHIBITION OF WATER COLOR PAINTINGS.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART.—EXHIBITION OF ANCIENT STATUARY, PAINTINGS, &c. Day only.


*THE NEW-YORK TIMES.*

THE NEW-YORK TIMES is the best family paper published; it contains the latest news and correspondence. It is free from all objectionable advertisements and reports, and may be safely admitted to every domestic circle. The disgraceful announcements of quacks and medical pretenders, which pollute so many newspapers of the day, are not admitted into the columns of THE TIMES on any terms.

TERMS TO MAIL SUBSCRIBERS.

*Postage will be prepaid by the Publishers on all Editions of* THE TIMES *sent to Subscribers in the United States.*

The DAILY TIMES, per annum, including the Sunday Edition.....$12
The DAILY TIMES, per annum, exclusive of the Sunday Edition.....10
The SUNDAY EDITION, per annum.....2
The SEMI-WEEKLY TIMES, per annum.....3
The WEEKLY TIMES, per annum.....2

CLUB RATES OF THE WEEKLY.

FIVE COPIES (per annum).....$7 50
TEN COPIES (per annum).....12 50
TWENTY COPIES (per annum).....22 00
THIRTY COPIES (per annum).....30 00

AND ONE EXTRA COPY TO EACH CLUB.

For every club of fifty, one copy of THE SEMI-WEEKLY TIMES to the getter-up of the club.

CLUB RATES OF THE SEMI-WEEKLY TIMES.

Two copies, one year.....$3
Ten copies, one year, (and one extra copy free).....25

New names may be added to clubs at any time during the year, at club rates.

THE SEMI-WEEKLY and WEEKLY mailed one year to clergymen at the lowest rates.

These prices are invariable. We have no traveling agents. Remit in drafts on New-York or Post Office Money Orders, if possible, and where neither of these can be procured send the money in a *registered* letter.

Terms, cash in advance.

Address THE NEW-YORK TIMES,
New-York City.

*NOTICE.*

We cannot notice anonymous communications. In all cases we require the writer's name and address, not for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

We cannot, under any circumstances, return rejected communications, nor can we undertake to preserve manuscripts.


*This morning* THE DAILY TIMES *consists of* TEN PAGES. *Every news-dealer is bound to deliver the paper in its complete form, and any failure to do so should be reported at the publication office.*

*THE UP-TOWN OFFICE OF THE TIMES.*

*A new branch office of* THE TIMES *has been established at No. 1,257 Broadway, between Thirty-first and Thirty-second streets, for the convenience of our up-town patrons, and is open daily, Sundays included, from 4 A. M. to 9 P. M. Advertisements and subscriptions received, and copies of* THE TIMES *for sale. Dealers supplied at 4 A. M.*

By means of the bill to reorganize the Treasury Department, which passed the House on Tuesday, a saving of half a million dollars a year will be effected. Otherwise, the changes contemplated are not specially important. It really makes no difference whether the second officer in a bureau is called a deputy, as he will be hereafter, or a chief clerk, as he has been heretofore. Still, the bill is a move in the right direction; it simplifies the working of one of the most important branches of the public service, and is likely to be imitated in other departments. The provision authorizing the redistribution of clerks and employes, so as to give each State its due quota, is most absurd, and ought to be struck out in the Senate. Washington clerkships are not of sufficient consequence to require a strict division among States; and the spirit that suggests such a partition is ridiculous.

A judicial decision, important to public corporations, was given yesterday in the case of the Metropolitan Gaslight Company against J. PIERPONT MORGAN. The defendant resisted the payment of a demand for gas furnished him, on the ground that he was assessed at a higher rate than that used in making the bills of persons residing in districts where the plaintiffs were obliged to compete with another corporation employed in the same business. The decision was practically in favor of the defendant, a judgment being given for the amount of gas consumed at rates corresponding with those charged in the other districts. The case is to be appealed, but the decision involves a principle which was well stated by Judge SPEIR, who said that a public corporation having large and valuable chartered privileges should administer its affairs on the broadest basis of equity and good conscience.

Mr. GEORGE WILSON, the Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, has prepared for the forthcoming annual report of that body, a carefully digested statement of the foreign commerce of this port, as compared with the aggregate of all the other ports of the United States. It appears that for the last fiscal year, the foreign imports into New-York reached a total value of over three hundred and ninety-five millions, gold, while all other ports account for an aggregate of about two hundred millions and three-quarters. The total of domestic exports from New-York for the year amounts to over three hundred and forty millions, while other ports account for three hundred and sixty-four millions. Mr. WILSON'S figures show how rapidly the other ports of the United States have been gaining upon New-York since 1871. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1871, the increase in the foreign commerce of this port, as compared with that of the previous year, amounted to over one hundred and thirty-nine millions of dollars, while all other ports showed an increase of only one million three hundred thousand dollars. By the following year, the relative distribution of the foreign trade of the Union had suddenly shifted, and against New-York's increase of forty millions and a half, all other ports showed an increase of thirty-nine millions and a quarter. By June 30, 1873, the balance shifted still more decidely against us, and New-York's increase stood at fifty-four millions, against seventy-four millions for all other ports. Last year the total decrease of sixteen millions and three-quarters on the total foreign trade of the Union is about equally distributed between New-York and other ports. As about three-fifths of the entire trade was done through New-York, this port would seem to have gained slightly on its competitors during the last fiscal year.

In another column we print a letter from a Nebraska correspondent who devotes some space to a few plain comments on "the grasshopper famine" in that State. We have had repeated warnings that this grasshopper story was being overworked, and now it is frankly said that the people of Nebraska are alarmed at the damage which is being done to the State by exaggerated accounts of the destitution wrought in their country by the ferocious grasshopper and the high-flying locust. It is a pity that good-natured and generous people should have been imposed upon by tales of imaginary woe; but, from what we can learn, there is very little foundation for the tales of distress that a few unthinking people have circulated. The Chicago *Tribune* has repeatedly called attention to the baselessness of these sensational reports of devastations by grasshoppers, and the latest accounts from the "stricken districts" remind us of nothing so much as the circulation of "overflow bacon" in the South just before the election, when Government aid was hawked about among well-to-do negroes for political purposes.

The recent decision of the Supreme Court in reference to the construction of the phrase "net earnings," as applied to railroads, is of considerable importance to the Government. The court holds that "net earnings" simply means that portion of the receipts of a road "which remains after the deduction of all charges or outlay as net profit." Everything connected with railroad management is traced nowadays to one "ring" or another; and newspapers are bewildered by the cries of speculators who are interested, on various sides, in elevating or depreciating the value of property. But we may at least assume with safety that the decision in question has been given, and may be reported, without suspicion of improper influences. It materially affects the position of the Government in reference to the roads to which it has extended subsidies, and we should think that at the present moment especially it is well worthy of serious attention at Washington.

Democracy in Tennessee continues to afford conspicuous proofs of its inability to properly govern the State. It has thus far done nothing to remedy the few evils which existed under Republican rule, and its mad persistence in the discussion of schemes for repudiation has quite discouraged those who hoped that some good might come from a change. The programme of the Democrats there, as in many other Southern States where they have power, seems to consist in liberal promises of reform and progress which are never fulfilled. If the extremists in the dominant party in the State are allowed to gratify all their caprices, it will not be long before Tennessee will be compelled in self-defense to cast them out. They cannot show that the State bonds are worth any more than under Republican rule, that business is any better and lawlessness less rampant, or that the deficiencies in the State Treasury are any less than when the Republicans were in office. On the contrary, their administration has been extravagant, and is already unpopular.

Our Washington dispatches say that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs have agreed to a bill providing for the distribution of the Japanese indemnity fund. It is proposed to return the last payment made —$375,000, gold—to the Japanese Government, divide $125,000 among the officers and men engaged in the naval expedition in behalf of the United States against the Japanese forts, and spend $300,000 for the education of American and Japanese youths as interpreters for consular offices in Japan and the United States. The amount of this fund is now about one million two hundred thousand dollars, and the sum remaining after the above division is made is to be carried into the Treasury. It is now in the keeping of the State Department. The objection to a distribution of any part of this fund as prize money is that claim agents would be likely to get the bulk of it. And it is almost certain that Japan would refuse to accept the moiety which it is proposed to return to her.

Yesterday's debate over the Costigan bill showed that Tammany Hall cannot command the obedience of the Democratic majority in the Assembly. Under the leadership of Mr. DAVIS, of Washington, seventeen members of the rural Democracy refused to place New-York City once more at the mercy of a gang of trading politicians, and so the Democratic principles represented by Gov. TILDEN, backed by Republican votes, scored a victory over those represented by JOHN KELLY and Mayor WICKHAM. After being defeated in their effort to cut off debate on the bill, the Tammany Democrats shirked, in the most ridiculous way, a direct vote upon its recommittal. The special order for the evening session was the Governor's Message, and the Speaker, who seems to take his weekly orders from JOHN KELLY with unfailing promptitude, ruled that this must take precedence of the pending question. It accordingly did, only to give way to a motion to adjourn, and so there was neither a division on the Costigan bill, nor a consideration of the Message. A lamer termination for a lively party fight could hardly be imagined.

*THE REVENUE BILL.*

The Democrats in the House of Representatives certainly did not shine in yesterday's debate over the proposals to increase the revenue. They contented themselves with vague and general declarations as to the possibility of making both ends meet by cutting down appropriations. Being challenged to point out the items on which retrenchment was possible, they took refuge in the usual loose talk about favoring the bloated bond-holders at the expense of the laboring masses of the people. Mr. BECK, Mr. COX, and the others who indulged in this familiar strain of Democratic oratory, ought to know that the preservation of the national credit is of just as much importance to the poorest day-laborer as it is to the magnates of the banking world, in whose interest they would have us believe that the Revenue bill has been framed. In fact, the man who depends on his daily wages has a good deal more to lose than the ordinary capitalist from a depreciation of the credit of the United States in the Exchanges of the world. The one can carry his money elsewhere much easier than the other can carry his labor, and it is very obvious that whatever impairs the borrowing power of the nation, impairs also the credit of every productive enterprise within our borders, and thus both curtails the earnings of labor and diminishes the demand for it. Depreciation of national credit involves higher interest-charges, arrests the industrial development of the country, and so calls for more taxes, while decreasing the ability to pay them. To disregard our solemnly-pledged obligations to provide for the sinking fund is not only a breach of good faith, but is a short-sighted attempt to save at the spigot while wasting at the bunghole.

The hopeless muddle of what the Democrats call their "policy" in regard to revenue questions was well illustrated in yesterday's debate. Some of them would prefer to restore the tax on tea and coffee rather than enhance the price of that time-honored Democratic beverage — whisky. Others seemed to think, with Mr. NIBLACK, that the tea and coffee duty was "infinitely a more odious tax and a less economical one." That enlightened statesman would rather resort to a temporary loan "to bridge over the present emergency" than pass this bill. To provide for a deficiency in the sinking fund by resorting to a temporary loan, means that the proper way to provide for the redemption of a debt is by adding to it. We believe that this trick of Treasury legerdemain is not unknown in Oriental finance. Mr. NIBLACK, however, deserves all the credit due to his attempt to introduce it here.

So far as it is possible to judge from the meagre result of yesterday's long debate, the House will pass the Revenue bill after some slight amendments. It may be that the advocates of sound theories of taxation will succeed in substituting the tea and coffee duties for the ten per cent. addition to the tariff on certain classes of manufactured goods. That, however, is doubtful, as is also the success of the attempt which will be made to prevent the somewhat inexplicable repeal of the match tax. The only two points on which a substantial agreement was reached in committee yesterday were, that the tax on whisky should be fixed as proposed by the bill, at one dollar per gallon, and that whisky in stock should pay a tax of eighty-five cents instead of seventy cents, as at present. The only amendment agreed to in the first section of the bill was that proposed by Mr. COX, namely, to add fifty per cent. to the duty on champagne. The mover of this claims that it would add $676,000 to the revenue. It is just as likely, however, to add a new stimulus to the manufacture of spurious imitations of imported sparkling wine. Whether it does this, or helps to increase the consumption of pure American champagnes, the calculations of Mr. COX are equally liable to be falsified.

*A NOBLE RACE.*

The hardships annually endured by the tough fishermen who dwell on the rocky New-England coast, and gain their livelihood by twice a year going down to the sea in fishing smacks have recently had a striking illustration. The usually boisterous water of the Atlantic, within ten or twelve miles of Cape Cod, has been transformed by the intense cold into an ice-field, where a fleet of fishing vessels lies blockaded so far from shore that it is feared many crews may perish from hunger, if not by freezing, before aid can reach them. Some of the crews have managed to get to shore in safely after a perilous journey across an ice-field everywhere dotted with dangerous air-holes; but the majority were, at last accounts, facing death under very trying circumstances—which seems to be almost the normal condition of the New-England fisherman. No man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow more certainly carries his life in his hand than this industrious and adventurous follower of the sea. A coast fisherman, who had been through twenty battles during the late war, once said that he would rather face the enemy in the thick of a fight than sail to the "George's Bank." Twelve hundred men have been lost at sea from the little town of Gloucester since 1830; and in 1873 the same port registered a loss of thirty-one vessels and 174 men. Provincetown, Marblehead, and the other places from which large fleets go out to catch cod and mackerel, lose many of their strongest and bravest men yearly. An ocean steamer, rushing through the thick fog on the Banks, cuts down some small smack, and the crew often is drowned. Or a sudden storm lashes the waves to fury, and upsets the skiffs in which hundreds of fishermen, two or three miles from their vessels, are peacefully at work. Or sometimes the frail vessels are wrecked when the weary men are just in sight of home, and the rocks on which the fishers played when children become their executioners.

These fishermen are always daring, but never reckless. They are, in the main, God-fearing folk, whose roughness of exterior consorts but poorly with their simplicity and native nobility of soul. They took a prominent part in the struggle for independence during the revolution. The port of Marblehead sent out the famous frigate *Constitution* and innumerable privateers. With the decline of the whale fisheries, once the principal support of many thousands of men on the coast, decay and ruin have approached some of the old towns, and are kept at bay only by the presence of small manufactures, which are gradually giving the ports a modern character. Formerly one could not visit Gloucester without finding sail-lofts in every street; the conversation was of anchors, ice-cushions, bait-mills, ships' blocks, masts, spars, boats, and leads, rather than of financial stocks, boots and shoes, and printed cloths. The men whom one encountered had but little interest landward; they rarely penetrated to the interior of their native State. Their whole attention was concentrated upon the preparations for the biennial sailing of the fleet into the fogs and gloom of the Newfoundland Banks; and when they went away it was solemnly, without any attempt at unseemly mirth; for they fully appreciated the peril to which they exposed themselves. Never yet did a fleet come back to the Massachusetts coast, or to any of the towns along the ragged Atlantic front of New-England, that the voices of mourners were not mingled with those of the happy wives and mothers who rejoiced over the safe return of their loved ones. Nowadays, of the thirty-five hundred men who sail from Gloucester every year, large numbers are Canadians, who come down from the provinces at the beginning of the fishing season, and work steadily through it, returning home with their pockets well lined. Yet, when the dangers and the outlay incidental to fishing on the Banks are considered, the rewards are really trivial. No fishermen accumulate even moderate fortunes; and it is not too much to say that none follow the trade all their lives without often falling into extremest peril. Among the fishermen now in the ice-floes off Cape Cod there may, doubtless, be found a score or two who have passed unscathed through a hundred quite as hazardous adventures, and who would succumb to the tedium of a monotonous security from harm.

Provincetown, the quaint little fishing port, at some distance from whose sand-hills the ice-bound fishermen are now expecting aid, usually has more than one hundred vessels and eleven hundred men engaged in the mackerel and cod fisheries. Gloucester in 1873 employed 375 vessels in fishing; the tonnage of the port was 28,565 tons; and the total value of the "catch" for the year was nearly four million dollars. Gloucester is the principal cod-fishing port of the country; next in order come the Cape Cod ports, and the towns of Portland, Wiscasset, Waldoborough, Belfast, and Castine, along the Maine coast. The vessels now blockaded in the ice-field probably belong to a variety of fleets, for the Cape Cod vessels do not ordinarily engage in Winter fishing. From whatever part of New-England they come, they are sure to receive succor from the citizens of Massachusetts if it is possible to give it to them, for the Old Bay State has a larger interest than any other in American fisheries and fishermen. Of the 559,982 quintals of cod entered as the product of our fisheries in 1870, Massachusetts ports contributed 451,125.

The United States Government has always rightly regarded the cod-fishery as a nursery of seamen for the Navy, and it was perhaps a little unwise to enact the legislation which, in 1866, took away the bounties formerly given to vessels engaged in the business. The fifteen thousand fishermen who yearly risk their lives in wresting its treasures from the sea, who face death on the "Grand Bank," in the ice-field, and along the rocky coast, are certainly entitled to hearty recognition as among the sturdiest and bravest of our citizens; and considering their many mishaps, and their value to the Government in war-time, a little substantial encouragement would do them no harm.

*PRECAUTIONS AGAINST COLD.*

It is not at all an improbable supposition that we have entered upon a "cycle" of cold Winters which may last for some years. There is—so far as anything can be made out from so unsettled a science as meteorology—a tendency to repetition of given grades of temperature during fixed periods. Possibly this is the mode in which the great secular changes of climate occur; that is, during brief periods the temperature rises or falls, and then, after that, never recovers its old scale. It is obvious that if we are to have five, ten, or twenty such Arctic Winters as this our community will be totally unprepared to meet them.

Neither our garments nor our buildings are fitted for such low temperature. If we regard such savage tribes or peoples as are familiar with cold from zero to 30° below, we find them using habitually the warmest garments. The Indians in British and Russian America are girt with close-fitting skins and furs, which are warmer than any clothing known to civilization. Their ears, head, and face are carefully protected. The Russians and Swedes wear the long fur robes, which are the warmest garment ever worn by civilized man, and are careful to cover neck, ears, and all sensitive parts. With the exception of long overcoats, our people are dressed this Winter as they always are in cold weather. Our ladies leave much of the head and face exposed, and are very indifferently clad against excessively cold weather. The consequence is a fearful crop of neuralgias, colds, and, among the old, severe attacks of pneumonia.

The houses are even still less adapted for such a Winter as the present. To ninety out of the hundred of city residents "life has been a strife" this Winter. It has been impossible to keep the house warm. House water-pipes have frozen. Unflushed drain-pipes have made whole neighborhoods odorous of bad gases. The "heater," built in close upon beams and combustible parts of the house, is a perpetual source of danger. And on the coldest days they give out little or no heat. They are simply a nuisance, as at present constructed. The procession of plumbers has been incessant to the unfortunate houses. Every street in the City, and sometimes every block, is impeded by the pavement dug up to melt the ice in the water-pipes in the streets. Country houses are even worse off. There are elegant villas where neither furnaces nor stoves could keep out the bitter north-west winds blowing, with cold at zero, and the whole family have had to abandon the northern rooms. Cisterns are frozen, water-pipes solid, drains closed, and water only attainable by drawing from deep wells.

A portion of our difficulties may be traced to our builders and architects. No architect seems to understand that the peace and comfort of domestic life depend mainly on water-pipes. The profession seem peculiarly indifferent where they put the "water works." There are scores of houses this Winter in which the bath-room and closets have been carefully placed by the builders in the coldest corner, and which have not had an unfrozen water-pipe for the whole season. In the country the first duty of the architect is to place the water-pipes behind the kitchen chimney, because this is a source of heat which never is exhausted. All features of the house plan should be sacrificed to this. Then, tanks and cellar-pipes should be carefully guarded, and all the water machinery arranged with reference to a possible temperature of zero. Our country houses, too, are built too slight and thin. The whole style should be changed. One would think from the structure of our villas that we had all through the year the temperature of Naples. It is doubtful if this sheathing of "felt" or tarred paper is so good a protection as "brick filled in," and certainly brick or stone walls are better. Our country houses, too, will have to adopt the brick porcelain-covered stoves of Russia and North Germany. Open grates will evidently not answer in such weather as we have had recently, even if accompanied by a furnace. Steam or hot water heating will not be advisable where water is so uncertain.

In the City, architects should aim especially at protecting the pipes in the cellars. And it does seem the duty of the City authorities to protect their street pipes and to insist on seeing that the mains are properly laid. Both City and country houses ought to make free use of double windows, for a double window is equal in its influence on temperature to a moderate fire. In fact, the community must begin to dress and to build as if Arctic Winters might come every year.

*MITCHEL, THE MARTYR.*

It is about a year since two great countries became a prey to conflicting emotions by the tidings that a lofty patriot was about to return to the land of his sires. While Columbia wept bitter tears as the vessel which bore JOHN MITCHEL from her shores was lost to sight, Britannia, like a guilty thing, trembled at the retribution which threatened her at the hands of this great and much-suffering son of her sister isle. Such, indeed, was the access of terror which his presence inspired, that the craven spirits of Downing street and Dublin Castle did not dare to take the slightest notice of his return. He came, saw, and conquered, as he had conquered before, the hearts of his countrymen, who hastened to render homage to the man whom a cruel and vindictive Government had sent—with excellent cabin accommodation, *ride* his own diary—into exile. The Duke of ABERCORN cowered amid the bowers of the Vice-regal Lodge, and Mr. DISRAELI, who had talked about a visit to Ireland, was clearly afraid to go while so redoubtable a foe was abroad.

Luckily, the patriot scorned to avail himself of the humiliating situation of his enemy by at once raising his standard and calling upon the faithful in Erin to flock to it, or there is no saying how high his head might not have been by this time. He would not a second time jeopardize, be the risk ever so small, the fortunes of adherents and retainers. Determined that the struggle should be peaceful and constitutional, he bided his time, and calmly awaited the day when a great constituency should return him as its champion to vindicate their rights on the floor of St. Stephen's. The constituency which has done that noble deed is that of Tipperary, the same which, some four years ago, earned immortal glory by returning Mr. O'DONOVAN ROSSA—who has since sagaciously subsided into a New-York ticket-office keeper—its representative.

How Tipperary managed to get the vacancy which enabled it to accomplish this business is at present rather a mystery. Its two members were a month ago Mr. O'CALLAGHAN, a young gentleman of twenty-two—eldest son of Lord LISMORE, one of the very few noblemen of Celtic origin in the House of Peers, who owns a great estate in the county—and Col. CHARLES WHITE. Col. WHITE was not only a Liberal, but a Home Ruler, who had undergone a good deal of contumely for having so avowed himself. The son and brother of Peers, Lord Lieutenant of the County Clare, an officer in the Household Brigade, and a man of fashion, the part of Radical Home Ruler Member of Parliament sat awkwardly upon the honorable and gallant Colonel, and exposed him to a great deal of unpleasant comment. It will be remembered by many that this was the gentleman who considered himself, and with good reason, libelously aspersed in the pages of a magazine in an article of which Lord DESART was the reputed author; and that his visit, in company with two military friends, to the castle of that nobleman to seek explanation as to his share in the offense, made such a noise that an account of the affair found its way into the columns of nearly every American newspaper. Col. WHITE has fought desperately for the several Parliamentary seats which he has occupied, and his resignation, coupled with the immediate return of Mr. JOHN MITCHEL, is remarkable. Of course, as the cable intelligence clearly shows, the entrance of MITCHEL into the Legislature is just as impossible as that of ROSSA, but these impotent returns have the double advantage of pleasing Tipperary and being a matter of profound indifference to the Government and Legislature of Great Britain. Tipperary, like Mr. Pickwick's friend, Mr. Peter Magnus, is evidently very easily amused. Perhaps the only persons who are to be seriously condoled with are the people of this country, inasmuch as this business may have the effect of once more dumping Mr. JOHN MITCHEL on to these shores.

*ICE FOR SUMMER.*

As the chances are that we shall have a very warm Summer this year, to compensate for the very cold Winter, it is some satisfaction to have assurance of the fact that the poor are not likely to suffer from a lack of ice. Last Summer the controlling ice companies put the prices up so high as to place this necessity of life entirely out of their reach. This they were enabled to do owing to the smallness of the crop harvested along the Hudson, 75,000 tons only having been stored by the 21st of February, while on the 1st of February of the previous year there had been 1,408,500 tons gathered. At the beginning of the present harvest, the managers of the Knickerbocker and Washington Companies, suspecting that the Winter would be severe enough to interfere somewhat with their calculations for large profits, fixed the rate of wages for "outside" hands at $1 25 per day. Whether this was done to cause a strike or not, we cannot positively say; but, to judge from the record of these gentlemen in the past, it would not surprise us in the least if such was the intent. However, a strike did occur. The men demanded $1 75 per day, and after a sufficient time had elapsed to insure for the circumstance all necessary publicity, it was granted, and work was resumed. The Knickerbocker Company, it is reported, has already stored nearly a million tons. The Washington Company has likewise its full supply, and the Mutual Benefit and Consumers' Companies are provided to the extent of their capitals. Individual firms have engaged in the work also. Altogether, according to the calculations of experts, the full amount harvested on the Upper Hudson will very nearly approach three million tons.

The Kennebec River ice-men have also been busy; but, as they have a reputation for shrewdness as calculators of the probabilities, it is reasonable to suppose that they have been less energetic than last year, when they harvested over two million tons, in order to profit largely by the comparatively open Winter on the Hudson. Still, if it shall appear that they have put away a good supply, it will be all the better for the New-York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City consumers. The BARMORES, or, in other words, the Managers of the Knickerbocker and Washington Ice Companies, have shown themselves so fruitful in furnishing reasons for raising the price of ice during the many years they have been in the business, that we do not doubt their ability to find a few—to them—very strong ones to meet the altered condition of circumstances which they will have to encounter during the Summer. The strike of the laborers to the casual observer would not seem to promise the groundwork for much of an argument in favor of fixing the prices at even a third of what they were last year, considering that the delay occasioned by it did not prevent the storehouses from being filled to their utmost capacity. But there is something behind the mere loss by stoppage which seems capable of being put together into a plausible argument. The Knickerbocker Company alone employed 476 horses and twenty-four engines in harvesting, and these were idle until the compromise was made. When work was suspended, there were numerous ice-canals open. These were frozen up very speedily, and as it is stated that each canal cost from $250 to $300 to open, the loss by closing may easily be set down at from $9,000 to $10,000, or $20,000, if the managers should not see a necessity to be accurate in their estimates. Then there may be losses by the non-fulfillment of large contracts; by the prospective mulcting of the companies in heavy damages for loss of life, through the negligence of their servants. In short, there are scores of equally plausible reasons that may be added to those we have hinted at, if the BARMORES, by an unforeseen stroke of luck, should not be able to circumvent the very weather itself before the time arrives when they will be called upon to fix the rates.

Now, to come to a question which the consumers will be most interested in: What can the companies afford to take per ton for the ice at wholesale this year? In 1870, in consequence of the warm weather, and the absence of anything in the shape of opposition, they raised the prices suddenly to $16 and $17 per ton. The following year, the establishment of a Consumer's Company brought the price down to $2 per ton. Since then the annual reasons for increase have been plentiful. If the Barmore companies could afford to have sold ice in 1871 at $2 per ton, considering the large amount in stock, is it not reasonable to suppose that they can sell it at the same price this year? At all events, admitting that it cost a trifle more to procure—and as to this there seems to be some doubt, after making allowance for the improvement in labor-saving machinery—still it ought not to go so high as $3 per ton. So that, on the whole, the housekeepers, before the end of the Summer, may have occasion to be thankful for the weather, the severity of which they now so unanimously grumble at.

*AMUSEMENTS.*

FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE.

A new play was last evening represented at the Fifth Avenue Theatre and stamped with the seal of public favor some time before its denotment. "The Big Bonanza" is not, properly speaking, a comedy, nor is it a prolonged farce, but it occupies the intermediate ground, to the productions of which the French, whose language is richer in many respects than ours, give the name *vaudeville*. Plot, incidents, and characters are of the most sketchy kind, but they exist nevertheless, and a few semi-serious, or rather romantic, passages prevent the piece from coming under the head of extravaganza pure and simple. Day before yesterday we printed in brief the story of "The Big Bonanza." It is taken from "Ultimo," a German work by Moser, but either the atmosphere of the original composition is decidedly cosmopolitan or else the adapter has dealt with his material very cleverly, for no exception can be taken to the truthfulness of the local coloring. Whether Moser or the unknown translator is to be thanked need not, however, be discussed; between them the public is supplied with a very enjoyable entertainment—and this is the main point. "The Big Bonanza" illustrates the follies of a learned man who ventures into Wall street, and is only saved from ruin by the shrewdness of a relative who has given him the means to try his hand at speculation, for the purpose of curing him of his boast that "brains" are invariably a match for business capacity. The development of this idea extends over four acts, and it introduces a dozen personages, who are all skillfully connected with the narrative, and a great many extremely comical situations. Mr. Daly, whose theatre, whose artists, and whose taste and liberality have long found fitting employment in bringing before fashionable audiences what we might call the confectionery of the drama, has once more, by a strong distribution of rôles and a magnificent stage attire, secured a performance of uncommon attractiveness. The merriment over the acting last night was incessant, and the tokens of admiration elicited by an array of superb dresses and several sets of exquisite beauty were numerous. Mr. James Lewis as the *savant* on 'Change, has a capital rôle, an excellent attire and a marvelous wig, and although no elaboration of the character is attempted —Mr. Lewis never straying from the beaten path of droll "make ups" and eccentric mannerisms which he has trodden with such happy results for years—the impression of *Prof. Cadwallader* is decided enough to compel hearty laughter. *Jonathan Cadwallader* has a most efficient representative in Mr. Charles Fisher. *Mr. Alphonsus De Haas*, a conventional fop, is acceptably portrayed by Mr. Parkes. Mr. Davidge appears *pro forma* as a venerable uncle, and Messrs. B. T. Ringgold, Owen Fawcett, and J. W. Jennings fill comparatively minor parts. As *Bob Ruggles*, a promising young man who keeps up the amatory interest of the piece, Mr. John Drew, of Philadelphia, made his début in this City. Proof that Mr. Drew is still a novice was not wanting, but an agreeable freedom from affectation, and a fresh and welcome heartiness of style were perceptible in his first effort here and augured well for his future. The ladies concerned in "The Big Bonanza" are Misses Graham, Davenport, and Rigl, and Mrs. G. H. Gilbert. Miss Davenport's acting in "The Big Bonanza" is remarkably good; at certain stages of the comedy it could not but suggest itself to everybody that no artist in New-York could replace the lady in depicting the merry, coquettish, and—to the extent modern society allows sentiment—slightly-sentimental young persons who, attired as fashion-plates which change from act to act, grace the drawing-room, and elegantly determine upon matrimony before the curtain falls. Miss Rigl, like Miss Davenport, is fully equal to her rôle, but she must be cautioned against overdoing pretty airs, and over-emphasizing sweet words. There is, of course, a wide and grateful distinction between solidity and animation; but there is a felicitous medium which Miss Rigl's excessive zeal ought not to carry her beyond. Of the remaining characters we need only remark that they were in competent hands, and repeat, ere we close, that the representation afforded much pleasure, and will in all likelihood bear nightly repetition for at least a month.

*WEST VIRGINIA.*

ALLEN T. CAPERTON ELECTED TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE—DEMONSTRATION IN CHARLESTON.

*Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.*

CHARLESTON, West Va., Feb. 17.—Allen T. Caperton, of Union, Monroe County, was to-day elected United States Senator, to succeed ex-Gov. Boreman, the present Senator from West Virginia. The Legislature had been balloting daily for more than three weeks, and the election of Mr. Caperton was a surprise, not only to himself, but to the political managers who had been working for the advancement of other candidates heretofore largely in the lead. His chances were considered very poor at the outset of the contest, and his name had been dropped in the Democratic caucus, which sat nightly for over four weeks without harmonizing.

THE TIMES correspondent was among the first to see the Senator at his rooms in the Hale House after the election. The venerable statesman was quite overcome with the news of his election and the congratulations of his friends, including Camden, Walker, and other defeated candidates. Forty-three votes were necessary to elect, and Caperton received thirty-five on roll call of the second ballot. The changing of votes was then begun by Representatives from Caperton's section, who had voted for Price and Moore, and continued until sixty-eight had been cast for the successful candidate. The friends of Walker, who had previously been the strongest candidate, anticipating no election, were paying a compliment to Judge Moore, of Point Pleasant, as they did yesterday to State Senator McGinnis, and the consequence was Walker was not voted for at all to-day. The election of Caperton caused a sensation throughout the densely crowded hall, and the news spread over the city like wildfire.

Senator-elect Caperton was born in Monroe County, Va., in 1811, and is consequently sixty-four years of age. He is a man of finished education, large information, courteous manners, and splendid dignity. He was educated at Yale College, and graduated from that institution in 1832. His great ability as a lawyer and high character as a citizen have made him not only a favorite in the new State, but a shining light of the Old Dominion, of whose declining aristocracy he is a conspicuous and worthy representative. He was a Senator in the Confederate Congress which sat in Richmond in 1863. He is a man of handsome physique, faultless in attire, pleasing face, and long, flowing, white beard. He is liberal in opinions, and universally respected. Grand demonstrations were held to-night in front of the Hale House, and speeches were delivered by Mr. Caperton and others.

*FLORIDA'S NEW SENATOR.*

The Tallahassee (Fla.) *Sentinel*, a Republican newspaper, gives some authentic information concerning Hon. Charles W. Jones, the newly-elected Democratic United States Senator from that State. Mr. Jones, it says, was born in Ireland in 1834, and came to this country when ten years old. He spent some years in Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and removed to Florida in 1854 and has made that State his home since that time. He was admitted to the Bar in 1857, and has since taken rank among the ablest lawyers of the State. He was a member of the Baltimore Convention in 1872, which nominated Horace Greeley for President, and later in the same year ran on the Democratic and Liberal ticket for Congress (State at large) against Hon. William J. Purman, (Republican,) present member of the State Assembly and Congressma elect, by whom he was defeated by 1,726 votes in a total of 33,348. In 1874 he was elected on the Democratic ticket to the lower House of State Legislature from Escambia County, which county he now represents in that body. Mr. Jones has always been a Democrat, and supported Stephen A. Douglas for the Presidency in 1860.

Concerning the manner of his election, after the protracted contest, the *Sentinel* thus speaks: "The final struggle took place between Horatio Bisbee, Jr., a Republican of irreproachable character and the finest ability, who was supported by nearly nine-tenths of his party, and Mr. Jones, the successful candidate, a liberal Conservative of the highest character, who concentrated the entire strength of the Conservative Party. Neither party was able to elect, while the four Independents held the balance of power with a purpose almost in equipoise as to whether they would throw their vote for the Conservative or Republican candidate. Two of the Independents, Mr. Sutton and Mr. Hill, had, with one or two exceptions, been casting their ballots throughout the long contest on the Republican side, and their preference was maintained up to the final ballot. Had the Republican ranks stood firm and sustained Mr. Bisbee, there is no question but these Independents would have come to the rescue; but soon after the balloting commenced the disaffected and recreant Republicans, who had labored for the defeat of the party, and who had time and again prevented concentration and the election of a Republican, broke ranks and threw away their votes on Westcott, Walker, and Magbee, causing the Independents to despair of honorable success, and forcing them, in vindication of themselves, to end the contest while it was in their power to secure an honest and worthy Conservative. We are gratified to know that while Mr. Jones is not a Republican, and therefore not the man of our choice for this high position to fill, to a large extent, the moral and intellectual qualifications that should go to make up a United States Senator. If we are not mistaken in our estimate of the man, Mr. Jones combines elements of character of a high order, and the people may rest assured that the Senator elect is an earnest, honest man, who will labor for their interests, and uphold and elevate the honor and dignity of the State of Florida."

*THE SUFFERINGS OF THE BIRDS.*

The Baltimore *Sun* of Monday has this paragraph: "The severity of the recent extremely cold weather in its effect on the birds of the air and the waterfowl has been mentioned. Many thousands of crows were frozen and starved: Hundreds of them have been found blind, unable to navigate from loss of sight, and helpless from cold and want of food. It is learned that this blindness is caused by the starved birds picking each other's eyes out at night on their roosts, where in their reduced state from hunger they f

# ALBANY.

## THE MAJORITY DIVIDED ON THE COSTIGAN BILL.

THE DEBATE IN THE ASSEMBLY—GOV. TILDEN'S FRIENDS COME TO THE FRONT—THEY PROPOSE TO REFER THE BILL TO A SPECIAL COMMITTEE—SPEAKER M'GUIRE SOLD OUT TO TAMMANY—HE TAKES THE FLOOR AND MAKES A FURIOUS PARTY SPEECH—A DIRECT VOTE ON THE BILL DODGED.

*Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.*

ALBANY, Feb. 17.—The Assembly has at last had a full-dress parade on the passage of the Costigan bill, and the Democratic division which has been predicted for some days past, was found to be no mythical fancy, but a fact severe enough to create a bitter struggle on the floor of the House. Gov. Tilden came squarely to the front in the measure, and, as the first vote taken on the bill showed, there were no less than seventeen members of the majority who were ready to believe in his professions and appreciation of reform, rather than in those of John Kelly and the hungry Tammany horde who now seek the loaves and fishes in the City of New-York. The fight was very adroitly opened by the Governor's adherents, and the Republicans as adroitly kept out of the fray, seeing that it was "not their funeral" exactly, and that the more the Democracy worried each other the better would be the chances of defeating the measure when it became necessary for the minority to exert what Gov. Alvord calls the "brute force" of votes. The most marked development of the debate was the position taken by Speaker McGuire, who went on the floor and cracked the party whip over the heads of the recalcitrant seventeen louder than it has been cracked at any previous time this session. His whole address was devoted to party, and his tone and language were at times quite severe. He advocated the party straight through, right or wrong, and threw down the gauntlet to the Governor in a very cavalier fashion. Many people inclined to the belief that his address was ill-timed and ill-judged in its tone, and I know that it stirred up strong feeling in some quarters where the policy should have been to allay excitement and prejudice. It is the general opinion also, that if the Republicans had voted for the previous question, the bill would have been beaten on the vote which would have followed on the main question, and thus disposed of in the most summary fashion. Mr. Daly asserts that his object in moving the previous question was to avert the very airing of ill-feeling and dissension which eventually followed, and not to shut off debate. The fact of the Speaker having visited New-York and been present at the Tammany Convention on Saturday afternoon, is very widely commented on in connection with his position on the floor to-day, and his address in the Tammany interest is looked on as a palpable showing of his connection with, or to some extent a political obedience to, that body.

THE DEBATE.

At 12:45 o'clock the bill came up in regular order for its third reading, and as soon as it was announced by the Clerk, Mr. Davis, of Washington, rose and offered the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That said bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Affairs of Cities, with instructions to report in lieu thereof a bill appointing Charles O'Conor, Horatio Seymour, Edwin D. Morgan, William M. Evarts, Francis Kernan, John Kelly, Henry C. Murphy, and Henry R. Selden Commissioners to prepare and report to the Legislature, on or before the 10th day of April next, a bill securing to the several municipalities in the State the right of local self-government, providing for the responsibility of municipal officers by a system of removal for cause, and by amenability in the courts to actions to be brought at the instance of tax-payers for any malfeasance in office.

In speaking to the resolution Mr. Davis said it seemed to him that this House, and especially the New-York delegation, owed something to the honest sentiment of the people of the State, and especially to the million of people who occupy Manhattan Island. With all deference to the motives of those who are pressing this bill here, he thought this House should move slowly. It had been suggested that the people wanted local self-government and home rule, and he wished to know whether there was any better way of securing this local self-government than by committing this subject into the hands of the eminent people named in the resolution.

Mr. Waehner said he saw no reason advanced in the argument of the gentleman from Washington why this bill should not pass now. The gentleman would not go further than he in the application of the principles of local self-government, and he saw no reason to believe that the proposition of the gentleman would in any way further the objects sought by this bill or the principles it embodied. To pass this resolution would be to thwart the bill and to defeat it, for such a commission to frame a general law would require a long interval to enable them to complete their task, and this Legislature would by that time have adjourned. Whence came all this array of public sentiment against this bill? It came from the Republican press, if from anywhere, certainly not from the great people of the City of New-York, who are most directly concerned. The Democratic majority of this House owes it to itself to carry out the wishes of the people as expressed at the late election in regard to the principles of home rule, and which very principles formed a prominent element in the platform upon which the Governor of this State was elected. He hoped the resolution would not pass, for in the City of New-York, which groaned under the pressure of the laws which other Legislatures had fastened on it, there had been for years past a practical denial to the people of that city to exert any power in the control of their own affairs.

Mr. T. C. Campbell said that last Fall the Democratic Party announced its platform of local self-government, and when the people had ratified that announcement, it was edifying to find a Democrat rising in his place here and speaking for the tax-payers of New-York City and moving to consign a bill which the people of New-York demand to the tomb of the Capulets. There were seventeen members on this floor authorized to speak for and represent the people of the Metropolis, yet the gentleman from Washington—from a rural district—is the first to move to indefinitely postpone this question.

Mr. Sheil, of Westchester, asked if the gentleman from New-York would be good enough to give a definition of what he meant by home rule.

Mr. Campbell said he thought every Democrat learned the meaning of the term from his earliest years. But he understood it to be the right of local divisions of the peoples' government to control the affairs of those divisions without subjection to centralized authority.

Mr. Shattuck, Democrat, of Steuben, said he was sorry to rise here to oppose a bill which he thought was needed by any section, but he had not thus far heard any reason advanced why the bill should pass. Not a single reason or argument had been advanced here to show that the people of New-York City wanted to have their form of government changed, or that there was any officer or set of officers holding positions in that City whom the people desired to dispose of by ousting them from office. He would like to know what the Governor thought of this measure, if the gentlemen having charge of the measure would or could answer.

Mr. Costigan said he understood the Governor to have stated that he was not opposed to this bill, and it was certain he had expressed those views in his Message.

A short exchange of questions ensued between Mr. Shattuck and Mr. Costigan as to the Governor's views, and the effect they ought or ought not to have on the action of a member, after which Mr. Daly, of New-York, said he saw no reason for such a display of debate as seemed to be here attempted. He felt that he was in a much better position than the gentleman from Washington to know the wishes of the people of New-York, and he knew that this bill proposed to give them the form of government they desired, with fixity of responsibility. He therefore moved the previous question.

There were loud cries of "No!" "No!" but he declined to withdraw his motion, and the vote on ordering the previous question was taken on a call for the yeas and nays. The motion was lost by a vote of 66 nays to 50 yeas, seventeen Democrats voting with the minority.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the resolution, and in speaking to the subject Mr. Davis said he had listened with great attention to all that had been urged here in support of this bill, and had become only the more firmly convinced that the resolution he had just offered should pass. This bill, if it became a law, would give to the Mayor of New-York a more despotic power than is in the hands of any man on this Continent, unless it be the President of the United States. For one he had seen enough of what home rule had done once before for New-York, and he did not wish to see it handed back to the same condition of affairs. New-York had had imperial "home rule" in 1870, and the world knew the consequence. It had made her governmental administration a scandal, and caused the very name of Tammany to stink in the nostrils of the people. The bill now before this House proposes to give far more absolute power than was ever enjoyed by the leaders of the corrupt ring to which he had just referred.

Mr. Daly, interrupting, said the facts as to the wrongs of the rule of 1870 were admitted, but said that at this time no such degree of immunity was contemplated. They now proposed to hold men to a very strict responsibility, and, in any event, the Mayor of New-York could be turned out by the will of the people in two years.

Mr. Davis replied that Mayor Hall never had any such power as this bill proposed to confer on the present Mayor. The Governor had a supervisory power over Sheriffs and County Judges all over the State, but he even could not remove them or any of them until after a hearing on charges preferred against them in regular form.

Mr. Waehner asked whether the gentleman from Washington knew that the approval of the Board of Aldermen was needed under the terms of this bill for the removal of officers, and that ample provision was made to hold the Mayor accountable for all his acts.

Mr. Davis replied that he knew all that, but there was a very wide latitude allowed in this bill, and no one could suppose that any intelligent, upright, independent citizen could be found who would take charge of any department if he was to be at the caprice of the Mayor. But tell the people that the efficient officer shall be protected in all his legal acts, not subject to any man's whim or prejudice, or to any local political necessity, and men of the highest position would begin to seek office, and undertake and faithfully execute its responsibilities. This bill was aimed to bring all offices subject to a local whim and influence, and to reduce all offices, however honorable, below the consideration of any but trading politicians.

Mr. Waehner asked if the gentleman had entertained the same opinions the other day when this measure was up in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Davis replied that he took no part in the discussion at that time. He claimed, however, that this bill was deficient in the first elements of Democratic principle, and unless local self-government could be established on a different basis from this, the people had better wait. The commission of eminent citizens named in this resolution were most capable of drawing up a bill which should vest in all the municipalities a safe and proper course by which and through which they might control their local affairs. Here was the Canal Department and the Department of State Prisons, which the people were now demanding should be reorganized and made to conform to the operations of broad and clear and honest general laws, and he thought this was the time and the method proposed in the resolution—the means to reorganize the system of municipal governments throughout the State. Above all things, he asked the majority in this House not to give New-York the home-rule which was contemplated by this bill.

Mr. Hammond being called to the chair, Speaker McGuire called attention to the fact that the people of the State had sent a Democratic majority here to do the legislation of the State, yet it was found that whenever any question of importance came up here, questions to carry out the wishes of the people, that majority dwindles down to a minority, simply because seventeen Democrats have seen fit to vote with the Republicans. If this is to be done, should the Democracy be held responsible for the legislation here? One gentleman had risen here and said that he could not vote for this bill on account of his slavish submission to the Governor. Now, said he, if the Governor has come on here and put his clutches on members to force them to vote and act contrary to the wish of the people, as represented in the Democratic Party, it is time it was known, and known now and here. He then proceeded to show that the provisions of this bill were exactly the same as applied to all other officials in the matter of removal. He asked: If you give power to an official to appoint, why should he not have the power to remove? Should that not follow? Is not that the principle which prevails in all parts of the State except in New-York? Is it so in that City now, the Mayor cannot remove a single officer or the most insignificant clerk without coming to the Governor. Was that right? Was it proper? He then proceeded to state how it was that the clause giving to the Governor the decision upon removals was put in the charter. It was done by the Republicans in 1873, because they did not dare to trust Mayor Havemeyer. Gov. Dix was in the Executive chair, and they felt they could trust him, hence the provision was put in the charter. Prior to that this power rested in the Mayor. This change was not in accordance with any principle. It was a mere political expedient. He called upon the majority to stand together and pass this bill as a party measure. He said the majority was making a disgraceful exhibition of itself here—disgraceful and shameful. It was disgraceful if the Executive of this State was using his influence here in this body. He could not understand how it was that these seventeen men were made to turn their backs upon their party.

Mr. Shattuck—If the gentleman had the information the seventeen did, he, too, might have gone with them.

Mr. McGuire—If I had "crooked the pregnant hinges of the knee, that thrift may follow fawning," in the Executive Chamber, perhaps I would.

Mr. Shattuck—Did not the gentleman go to New-York last Saturday?

Mr. McGuire—There is the cry of Tammany and its influence again—a cry which is mere claptrap. He asked where the gentleman would be were it not for Tammany Hall. He would be in retirement in his rural home instead of being here. He proceeded to argue that it was the duty of the party to pass this bill.

Mr. Davis said he was still more firmly convinced now that this resolution should pass, for the only argument advanced by the last speaker was that of party necessity, or expediency, and he denied that there was, as had been stated, any true Democratic principle embodied in the proposals and changes contemplated by this bill. So far as he was concerned, he knew no skulking, but dared to vote here for or against any measure which his conscience told him was right, and in this case his conscience told him that the bill was wrong.

Mr. Waehner replied briefly to some technical questions as to the bill.

A RETREAT TO RALLY.

At this juncture Mr. Hammond moved that the House take a recess until 7:30 o'clock P. M., which was opposed with cries of "No," "No;" "Let us have it now," "Withdraw your motion." Mr. Husted called for the yeas and nays, and the motion was carried by a vote of 66 yeas to 50 nays. This of course put over the consideration of the Governor's Message once more, which had been made the special order for this evening.

EVENING SESSION—THE LATEST ABOUT THE COSTIGAN BILL.

The Assembly met this evening at 7:30 o'clock, and Speaker McGuire, upon taking the chair, announced that the question before the House was, by special order, the consideration of the Governor's Message. Mr. Davis appealed from the decision of the Chair, as he considered the subject before the House to be the resolution offered by him in the morning, and which was still pending when the motion to adjourn was carried. Upon the appeal there was but a slight debate, Mr. Alvord sustaining Speaker McGuire, and Mr. Husted disagreeing with his decision and asking to be excused from voting, since, as he was once himself Speaker, he would feel a delicacy in voting not to sustain the decision of the Chair. The yeas and nays were then called upon the appeal, and the Speaker was sustained by a vote of 65 to 29. Mr. Davis moved that the consideration of the Governor's Message be postponed for one week. The motion was lost, and amid considerable laughter the Clerk began to read the Message. He had hardly finished the first sentence, however, before a motion that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again was carried, and the Assembly then immediately adjourned upon motion of Mr. Oakley.

The voting was somewhat promiscuous on the several motions lost and carrried; but it was apparent that the Republicans wanted nothing better than to meet the question at once, while the Democrats were still more anxious for delay, in the hope that by to-morrow, beyond which time the matter can hardly be postponed, enough votes can be drummed up to render the success of the bill less a matter of guess-work than it is at present. To-night they were clearly afraid to risk a vote on the main question. At midnight the situation was without material change, or if there has been any change it is in favor of the opponents of the bill. The issue between Tammany Hall and a considerable following of the rural Democrats on the one hand, and Gov. Tilden on the other, is unmistakably defined, and many expressions which are extremely undignified when applied to the Governor of the State are freely and openly bandied against him. One of the most prominent officers of the Legislature made the remark to me to-night that he "did not care a cent about the success or failure of the Costigan bill, but he did not want old Granny Tilden to suppose that he was the whole Democratic Party, or that he could run the party. He had already alienated himself from Tammany Hall, and if he thought he could now get along with ten or a dozen 'strikers' as a party at his back, let him try it." At this hour the strength of the recalcitrant seventeen is certainly unabated, and may, perhaps, be strengthened, and there is every indication that the Costigan bill will not be heard of after to-morrow. It comes up in the regular order of unfinished business immediately after the reading of the journal, and will be disposed of at once after debate. Many persons here express the belief that the friends of the bill will not let it come to a vote, but that they will make some dilatory motion so as to lay it aside, and that will be the last of it. It may be safely accepted that this Legislature has seen its most useful days, for the "split" which has developed itself to-day will last through the session, and whatever work is done will most likely be done by the Republican minority, aided by the now famous "seventeen," whose development is singularly coincident with the day of the month on which they have thus made their début.

THE VOTE.

The following is the list of yeas and nays on the vote on ordering the previous question:

YEAS—Messrs. Beach, Bennett, Berry, Bowen, Bradley, Brogan, T. C. Campbell, Christopher, Cleary, Coffee, Cole, Costigan, Daly, Dessar, Edson, Ely, Faulkner, Friend, Hammond, Hauschel, Hogan, W. Johnson, Keenan, Kennaday, Kirk, Kubicka, Mackin, McGowan, McGroarty, J. W. Miller, Muller, Oakley, O'Keefe, Page, Pierson, Reilly, Rich, Schenck, Schuyler, Sherman, Silverman, Smith, the Speaker, Stauf, Stephens, Talmadge, G. Taylor, Vosburgh, Waehner, Witbeck—50.

NAYS—Messrs. Alvord, Badger, Barkley, Bishop, Bordwell, Bowen, Braman, Broas, Brown, Burtis, Calkins, Clark, Comstock, Cooke, Daggett, Davis, Decker, Farrar, Fay, Fish, Fream, Gallagher, Gedney, Green, Griffin, Hanrahan, Hepburn, Hess, Hinckley, Houghton, Hussey, Husted, Ives, W. A. Johnston, Krack, Law, Lawrence, Lawson, Lewis, Lillybridge, Lincoln, W. Miller, Petty, Pope, Prince, Ransom, Roscoe, Russell, Sanford, Schofield, Seward, Shattuck, Sherwood, Sicell, Slingerland, Stacy, Struble, W. F. Taylor, Tewksbury, Vedder, Wellington, Wenzel, Wetherbee, Whitmore, Willis, Wurts, Yost—67.

BUSINESS IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate to-day the session was chiefly occupied in the consideration of local bills, and none of interest to the State generally or to the City in particular were passed. It was noticeable, however, that Senator Johnson's bill, providing for the resumption of specie payments in the State in 1879, was ordered to a third reading without opposition. The general opinion seems to be that the bill will pass the Senate and may pass the House.

Senator Robertson, from the Judiciary Committee, reported adversely to-day the bill introduced in the Assembly by Mr. Prince, to exclude from the right of suffrage all persons convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, and reported, with amendment, Mr. Prince's second bill, providing that a voter, upon being challenged, shall swear that he has not bet upon the result of the election. These bills will be remembered as two of the five general bills introduced by Mr. Prince some three weeks ago. The reports of the Judiciary Committee were accepted by the Senate and are approved by Mr. Prince himself, their purpose being not at all to undo Mr. Prince's work, which now remains in effect as before, but to consolidate his two bills into a single amendment of the Election law.

Yesterday was announced the resignation, by Hon. William A. Rice, of the office of New Capitol Commissioner, and to-day Mr. Hamilton Harris sent a communication to the same effect to Gov. Tilden. Mr. Kingsley, it will be remembered, had previously resigned, and from a positive statement to that effect can not be made, it may be assumed as probable that the remaining members of the commission will also soon give up their positions.

## THE SMUGGLED SILKS.

We learn that the statement that a portion of the goods which Mlle. Juvin attempted to smuggle into this City without the payment of duties were intended for Mrs. David Dudley Field and Mrs. Cyrus W. Field is an error. We are informed that neither of these ladies had given her any order whatever.

## MILITARY INTELLIGENCE.

THE ARTILLERY SCHOOL AT FORTRESS MONROE—ANNUAL CHANGES.

FORTRESS MONROE, Va., Feb. 15.—The following order announcing the annual changes at the Artillery School at this place has just been received:

HEAD-QUARTERS ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, St. Louis, Mo., Feb. 8, 1875.

SPECIAL ORDERS No. 7.—The following transfers of Lieutenants of Artillery are made under the provisions of General Orders No. 98, Nov. 13, 1867, from these head-quarters, establishing the Artillery School at Fortress Monroe, Va. The officers of the new detail will report for duty to the commanding officer of the Artillery School May 1, 1875, when those relieved will join their new companies. If the officers relieved join their proper stations within thirty days over and above the time necessary to reach them in proper course, it will be deemed a compliance with this order.

*First United States Artillery.*—First Lieut. J. H. Counselman, Regimental Adjutant, is hereby attached to Company G for instruction; First Lieut. Edward D. Wheeler, from Company G to such company as his regimental commander may assign him; First Lieut. E. Van A. Andrus, from Company F to Company G, vice First Lieut. E. A. Whitmore, from Company F, to be relieved; Second Lieut. Henry M. Andrews, from Company C to Company G; Second Lieut. Frank S. Rice, from Company E to Company G.

*Second Artillery.*—First Lieut. John H. Catef, Regimental Adjutant, is hereby attached to Company K, for instruction; First Lieut. John C. Keantling, from Company K to such company as his regimental commander may assign him; First Lieut. John H. Lord, Regimental Quartermaster, is hereby attached to Company K, for instruction; First Lieut. Edward B. Hubbard, from Company K to such company as his regimental commander may assign him; Second Lieut. Edgar S. Dudley, from Company E to Company K; Second Lieut. Albert H. Mellen, from Company H to Company K, vice Second Lieut. Edward M. Cobb, from Company K to Company H, to be relieved.

*Third Artillery.*—First Lieut. Constantine Chase, from Company D to Company A, vice First Lieut. Lewis Smith, from Company A to Company D, to be relieved; First Lieut. Albert F. Pike, from Company L to Company H, vice First Lieut. George H. Thurston, from Company H to Company L, to be relieved; Second Lieut. C. A. M. Smith, from Company K to Company H, vice Second Lieut. Ira MacNutt, from Company H to Company K, to be relieved; Second Lieut. John A. Myers, from Company M to Company A, to be relieved; Second Lieut. B. H. Randolph, from Company A to Company M, to be relieved.

*Fourth Artillery.*—First Lieut. John W. Loder, Regimental Adjutant, is hereby attached to Company I for instruction; First Lieut. Harry R. Anderson, from Company I to such company as his regimental commander may assign him; First Lieut. William Kunis from Company H to Company I, vice First Lieut. C. A. L. Totten, to Company H, to be relieved; Second Lieut. Lieut. James L. Wilson from Company M to Company I, vice Second Lieut. Jacob E. Bloom, from C mpany I to Company M, to be relieved; Second Lieut. George L. Anderson from Company G to Company I.

*Fifth Artillery.*—First Lieut. William B. Beck, Regimental Quartermaster, is hereby attached to Company C, for instruction; First Lieut. Charles Morris, from Company G to Company C, vice First Lieut. Paul Roemer, from Company C to Company G, to be relieved; First Lieut. Luigi Lomia, from Company B to Company C, vice First Lieut. Frank Thorpe, from Company C to Company B, to be relieved; Second Lieut. Edward T. Brown, from Company D to Company C, vice Second Lieut. William B. Homer, from Company C to Company D, to be relieved; Second Lieut. William H. Coffin, from Company C to Company K, to be relieved.

By command of Gen. SHERMAN.

In addition to the above list, Second Lieut. D. H. Floyd, Ninth United States Cavalry, is ordered to report at the school for one year's instruction at his own request.

This school has been in successful operation for the past five years under the direction of Gen. William F. Barry, and is exerting a wholesome influence in raising the standard of the officers of artillery.

By direction of the President, First Lieut. G. N. Whistler, of the Fifth Artillery, is detached as Professor of Military Science and Tactics at the Kentucky University at Lexington.

## THE SOCIETE ALSACIENNE LORRAINE.

The annual ball of the Société Alsacienne Lorraine took place at Irving Hall last night. In point of attendance and the respectability of the assemblage, which embraced many of the most influential French residents of the City, it surpassed all former affairs of the kind given by the society. The hall was very tastefully draped with the tri-color of France and the Stars and Stripes, entwined in graceful folds. The most conspicuous and attractive decoration, however, was a circle of gas-jets surrounding the legend, "Alsace—Lorraine—1875," raised to a height of fifteen feet at the upper end of the hall, immediately facing the entrance, beneath it being suspended an original painting entitled "Vive La France," executed by F. Heller, an Alsatian artist, of Providence, R. I. The dancing commenced at 10 P. M., and did not conclude until the usual hour in the morning. Among the ladies were three costumed as Alsatian peasant girls, the peculiarity of whose short dresses, beside the predominant silks and tulles en train, made them the objects of no slight share of attention. Among those present were Mr. Joseph Strauss, the President; M. Imbert, French Vice Consul; A. Salmon, President of the Cercle Français de l'Harmonie; M. Meunier, Managing Editor of the *Courrier des Etates Unis*; L. Dezarnauld, First Vice President; J. Tartier, Second Vice President; A. D. Duville, Treasurer; W. B. Maclay, Joseph Blum, and other officers of the organization. The receipts of the affair, which were very large, will be disbursed in alleviating the distress of the refugees from Alsace and Lorraine.

## SUSPENSION OF A STRAW-GOODS FIRM.

The firm of Vyse & Co., manufacturers of straw goods, No. 537 Broadway, suspended payment yesterday. Rumor places their liabilities at a sum over a million of dollars. Mr. Thomas A. Vyse declined to state what the actual amount involved was, but did not deny the truth of the rumor. In a few days, he said, he hoped to make some arrangements with the creditors, but he could not say whether the firm would be able to continue business or not. The amount of business annually transacted by the firm had been very extensive until within the past year, and to the general stagnation in trade, combined with their inability to collect many outstanding accounts, their failure might be attributed.

## THE RAPID-TRANSIT MOVEMENT.

The next step toward the raising of the deferred capital stock fund will be the organization of the present subscribers into an association. Circulars have been issued by the Secretary Mr. C. H. Roosevelt, and a meeting will be called immediately for the above purpose. The Cheap Transportation Society is now anxious to unite with the deferred capital stock fund projectors, and to associate both endeavors so as to accomplish the objects of cheap transportation and rapid transit. Nothing positive has been done toward completing the union up to the present.

# THE RAILROAD WAR.

## REDUCTION OF PASSENGER RATES TO THE WEST.

MR. GARRETT PUSHES ON THE ATTACK—TOM SCOTT INTERPOSES A COUNTER-CHECK—HE MAINTAINS HIS REGULAR RATES—THE ERIE AND NEW-YORK CENTRAL DO THE SAME—MR. GARRETT SECURES A LINE OF STEAMERS TO BALTIMORE—FREIGHTS TO BE LOWERED—THE HOTEL TICKET AGENTS JUBILANT.

The war between the Baltimore and Ohio and the Pennsylvania Central Railroads still continues with unabated animosity on both sides. Besides the paper bombardment begun from the strongholds of both parties in Philadelphia and Baltimore, more active measures have been taken by Mr. Garrett. Early yesterday morning placards announcing a notable reduction in passenger rates between this City and the West were posted at the passenger and freight offices of the Baltimore and Ohio Road at Nos. 261 and 315 Broadway. The reductions in the rates to the principal Western cities are: To Chicago, $16 25 from $22; Cincinnati, $16 25 from $20; Louisville, $18 25 from $24, and St. Louis, $21 25 from $—, the agents here receiving strict instructions not to sell tickets to speculators. As a counter-check to this, new tickets were issued yesterday by the Pennsylvania Central to the Charles Street Depot in Baltimore, which is distant about two miles and a half from the President Street Depot of the Baltimore and Ohio Road. This was done with a view to compel that company to transfer its through passengers and their baggage by carriages in order to make the connection. This, the Baltimore and Ohio people say, is of little consequence, as they are fully prepared for that contingency, and will have no difficulty in making their transfers and connections.

Up to a late hour last evening the Pennsylvania Central, New-York Central, and Erie Roads had made no reduction in their passenger rates West, and it seemed to be the general impression in the ticket offices of these lines that none would be made for some days, if at all.

Since Saturday last no freight has been received by the Baltimore and Ohio Road in this City, and none at their Western depots for any point between Philadelphia and New-York. Their freight delivery to other Eastern localities was not interfered with by the rupture, as they have direct lines of steamers running between Baltimore and Boston and Baltimore and Providence. At a late hour yesterday afternoon they were put in position to resume their carrying business, as they succeeded in closing an advantageous contract with the Old Dominion Steam-ship Company, and will be prepared almost immediately to receive freight at reduced rates at Pier No. 37 North River.

The quarrel between the companies, which was publicly begun on Saturday, was really commenced on the 3d inst., at the railroad meeting held in the St. Nicholas Hotel. At that meeting Mr. John King, Jr., President of the Baltimore and Ohio Road, complained bitterly that the roads belonging to the Saratoga combination had not acted in good faith with the road he represented. In support of his allegations he produced a bundle of affidavits six inches in thickness, containing statements of railroad men and others, which he had obtained for the occasion. After a very stormy discussion the matter was partially patched up, only to break out with more violence than ever, as has been seen. In this connection, a gentleman, who is well informed on railroad matters, said to a TIMES reporter yesterday that the late developments corroborate what was alleged by many persons earlier in the season. He said that the combination originated with the Pennsylvania Central for the purpose of securing the aid of all lines west of New-York in the warfare that was bound to be waged, sooner or later, between the Pennsylvania Road and the Baltimore and Ohio. The Presidents of the Erie and New-York Central acceded to the demands, and signed the rules and regulations known as the "Saratoga compact," to establish, as they supposed, a better standard of rates. The Baltimore and Ohio verbally agreed to the contract that accomplished Mr. Scott's purpose, and a few months of unsatisfactory business for all parties, except the originator, followed. He saw that the Baltimore and Ohio was extending its connections, with less miles of track, to the same great Western points that the Pennsylvania Central possessed. He saw the line was assuming shape between New-York and Philadelphia, which, when completed, would be equal in all respects for New-York and New-England patronage, and superior for that of Baltimore and the South. It was, therefore, his policy to hamper the Baltimore and Ohio before it entered New-York. Hence his action in urging the Saratoga movement.

Although it has been authoritatively stated by the passenger agent of the Baltimore and Ohio, in this City, that no tickets will be distributed for sale among the hotel ticket agents, it seems to be universally regarded by them as the beginning of the end. When the combination went into effect they all expressed their determination to carry on their business, even at a loss, until tickets were restored. To that end they have given information to the public and sold tickets at the same rates as at the depots, without profit, believing that there were too many antagonistic interests to be reconciled for the combination to last for many months. They believed it was a combination of strong lines against the weak, operating to the inconvenience of the public. Having firm faith in the instability of the arrangement, they have striven to keep their business together, and now congratulate themselves upon the prospect of its return. They claim that strong proof exists of the continued violation of passenger rates by one company in particular.

## TOM SCOTT'S SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

SCOTT SAYS GARRETT'S STATEMENTS ARE NOT WARRANTED BY THE FACTS—PHILADELPHIA FAVORS ITS OWN ROAD IN THE FIGHT—THE GENERAL IMPRESSION THAT THE BALTIMORE ROAD WILL SUFFER MOST—ACTION OF THE RIVAL COMPANIES YESTERDAY—THE NEW SCHEDULE PUT FORTH BY THE BALTIMORE COMPANY.

*Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.*

PHILADELPHIA, Penn., Feb. 17.—The contest between the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad each day seems to develop a greater determination on the part of the opposing companies to meet the reductions and conflicting measures of each other. Col. Scott, on being questioned this afternoon as to his opinion of the informal rejoinder given by President Garrett to his reply of yesterday, said the position assumed by the latter was not warranted by the facts, and that his [Scott's] note contained an equitable review of the injunction. The presumption here is that the Baltimore and Ohio Company, in their efforts to defeat the plans of the Pennsylvania Railroad, are taking a course which will not only defeat its own object, but result in a material detriment to the road. This, however, is not relied on by most people, for although there can be no doubt that reductions at every point will temporarily impair the interests of both organizations, the desired combinations will eventually be effected. Four through trains are now running every day, except Sunday, each way between this city, New-York, and Washington, and one of them, the limited express, makes the trip in six hours and forty minutes. In fact, the accommodations of the Pennsylvania Railroad will be as great, according to the assurances of the officers of the company, as they ever were; while the contending company will make every exertion to increase their present facilities and meet the policy of the former at each successive turn. It is certain, however, that Mr. Garrett cannot affect the sale of through tickets or interfere with the through tariff, while the withdrawal of certain privileges in the disposition of tickets afforded to the Baltimore and Ohio Road will cause that corporation no inconsiderable loss. The latter action has greatly surprised the officials of Mr. Garrett's road, and the result is that the Baltimore and Ohio are obliged to supply through tickets from this city to Baltimore, for which they pay to the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad, which road has maintained neutral ground, $3 15 per head. From Baltimore they carry passengers to Pittsburg for the remaining $4 85, which does not allow much profit to be made. Col. Scott and Mr. D. M. Boyd, Jr., General Ticket Agent of the Pennsylvania Company, had a conference to-day, resulting in the issue of instructions to the ticket agents of the Pennsylvania Road at Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Southern and Western points to sell tickets at the same rate as the Baltimore and Ohio are asking. It was agreed, it is understood, to sell tickets between Boston, New-York, and the West, by way of Baltimore, which unexpected action will be unwelcome to the officers of the Baltimore and Ohio. On the whole, the fight promises to be characterized by the same vigorous measures that distinguished the discord between these roads several years ago. This afternoon the following schedule of prices was issued from the office of the Baltimore and Ohio in this city:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| To Pittsburg | $ 8 | To St. Louis | $17 |
| To Cincinnati | 12 | To Chicago | 12 |
| To Louisville | 14 | | |

These new rates will not go into effect until noon to-morrow, by which time the agent conjectures a still further reduction will be made. In the meantime the sale of tickets is suspended. A representative of the Baltimore and Ohio will arrive here to-morrow, for the purpose of attending to the interests of that road, and making regulations intended to counteract the movements of the Pennsylvania line. As a matter of course, the feeling here is generally in favor of President Scott, but the company's stock declined on the Stock Board to-day from 55⅝ to 55.

THE PHILADELPHIA PEOPLE ARE ALL SATISFIED THAT TOM SCOTT IS QUITE RIGHT—CHARGES THAT MR. GARRETT ARROGANTLY DECLINED TO ENTER INTO A COMBINATION AND VIOLATED HIS PLEDGES.

*Dispatch to the Associated Press.*

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 17.—No further communication had taken place between Col. Scott and President Garrett, of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, since the rejoinder of the former.

All the officials of the road, as well as the people in this section interested in the freight traffic from the West, unite in the opinion that Col. Scott's letter is a complete answer to the charges made by President Garrett. It is claimed that Mr. Garrett entered, as early as April, 1873, into an arrangement relative to the competitive business of both companies, whether for New-York, Boston, Philadelphia, or Baltimore, whether local or through, which, as Col. Scott declares, "has been repeatedly violated by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company's officers within the past two months."

It is further stated that while Mr. Garrett virtually accepted the "Saratoga compact," which was made in November last, he has failed to carry out his pledges in good faith. The effect of Col. Scott's reply is simply the refusal of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company to allow the Baltimore and Ohio cars to run over its line between Philadelphia and New-York; and it is stated that instructions have been given to its employes to take no freight and issue no tickets from the latter place to points on the Baltimore and Ohio Road, and to honor no through tickets issued by that company. The action of President Garrett in declining to join the Saratoga combination, and his persistence in fixing rates to and from Chicago without regard to the views of the other trunk lines, is the cause of this step. Mr. Garrett arrogated to himself the right of fixing a schedule of rates from the West to New-York, when in fact he controlled no line between the two points. If he had made the schedule apply to the road his company alone controlled, leaving of course out of the question any pledges which may have been made, the case against him, it is claimed, would not have been so serious; but he assumed the point of fixing rates over the roads from Baltimore to New-York, which he used simply by permission of the Pennsylvania and Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad Companies.

## MR. GARRETT'S VERSION.

HE WILL ASK NO FAVORS AND ACCEPT NO COMPROMISE—THIS FIGHT FORCED BY SCOTT'S ATTEMPTING TO FORCE THE BALTIMORE ROAD TO MAKE HIGHER RATES—THE ISSUE MAINLY A MATTER CONCERNING NEW-YORK—BALTIMORE IS SUFFICIENT FOR ITS ROAD—FACTS SHOWING ITS INCREASE OF BUSINESS.

*Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.*

BALTIMORE, Feb. 17.—In conversations today between THE TIMES correspondent and the chief authorities of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, it was stated that the railroad war was about in *statu quo*, so far as active movements are concerned, and that they are waiting further developments on the part of the Pennsylvania Road. Their cars are not yet prohibited from passing over the New-Jersey lines, between Philadelphia and New-York. It is the determination of the Baltimore and Ohio to ask no favors in this conflict, to yield to no compromise, and to fight it out to the bitter end, for the vindication of its independence, and right to fix its freight and passenger tariffs without regard to any combination whatever. Garrett stands on absolutely independent grounds, persuaded that he can maintain himself upon them; and for such reasons he does not regret the situation which has been forced upon him. It will interest New-Yorkers most to know that the present struggle is likely to stimulate the enterprises on foot for the establishment of two competitive through routes between New-York and Washington—Scott and Garrett each controlling one. With regard to Scott's statements that at the November meeting here of railroad Presidents, Garrett agreed to abide by the Saratoga conference, they are utterly denied on the highest authority. At that meeting Garrett not only refused to recognize the combination, but distinctly stated that in no event would his road conduct its rates or acts with the slightest reference to them. He also denounced fast freight lines, which are at the bottom of the effort to keep up the high rates between the West and the sea-board, and which he terms vampires of transportation business. In the event of Scott persisting in his version of the November meeting, the record of its actual proceedings, which is understood to be in existence, may be given to the public in substantiation of Mr. Garrett's statements. It is denied that the Baltimore and Ohio ever undertook to fix the rates between New-York and the West, as charged by Scott. What it did was to make the tariffs for Baltimore lower than for any other terminus, and in consequence business has sought this port in preference to others, at which it must pay the higher rates of the Saratoga combination. The result has been to draw trade away from the Pennsylvania Road, and to make Baltimore the favorite Atlantic depot and entrepot for the West. Merchants of New-York suffering from this difference operating against them, have brought pressure to bear upon Scott to do for them what Garrett has done for Baltimore; but as a last endeavor to maintain the high rates, Scott endeavors to force the Baltimore and Ohio to his terms by cutting it off from New-York. As remarked by Mr. Garrett, the question is really one that concerns the New-York business community more than it does Baltimore or his road. It would be to the interest of New-York to let the Baltimore and Ohio come there as a competitor with Scott's road; but if it is refused access to the Metropolis, it still has its great outlet here, and transportation will follow the line which accommodates it with the best and cheapest facilities. As an instance of this fact, it is stated that the Baltimore and Ohio has just completed a contract to ship from Baltimore to Chicago 100,000 bags of coffee for houses that never before had dealings here. Chicago firms are now calling for all the sugar that can be sent from this port. The largest refinery here is now shipping its full capacity of 1,000 barrels daily without being able to meet the demand. The Government has just made a contract with the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company for a through mail service between Chicago and Baltimore, over the new road, which takes a valuable business from the Pennsylvania Company. The situation, on the whole, is thoroughly favorable to the Baltimore and Ohio, whether it gets into New-York by the New-Jersey roads, or at some future date by a new line that can very shortly be placed in operation. There is no fear here as to the result, which, as generally believed by our business community, must in any event conduce to advance local interests.

It is also understood that the Baltimore and Ohio Company is arranging for a line of first-class steamers to transport its traffic between

## COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS.

NEW-YORK, Wednesday, Feb. 17, 1875.

The receipts of the principal kinds of Produce since our last have been as follows:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashes, pks | 23 | Resin, bbls | 3,243 |
| Bees-wax, pkgs | 4 | Oil-cake, pkgs | 740 |
| Cotton, bales | 3,106 | Pork, pkgs | 435 |
| Candles, pkgs | 100 | Cut-meats, pkgs | 1,794 |
| Dried Fruit, pkgs | 191 | Lard, pkgs | 397 |
| Lega, bbls | 482 | Stearine, pkgs | 50 |
| Flour, bbls | 7,490 | Butter, pkgs | 3,579 |
| Wheat, bushels | 19,320 | Cheese, pkgs | 75 |
| Corn, bushels | 21,700 | Dressed Hogs No. | 850 |
| Oats, bushels | 7,400 | Pea-nuts, bags | 684 |
| Malt, bushels | 1,750 | Rice, pkgs | 75 |
| Grass-seed, bags | 350 | Skins, No | 323 |
| Beans, bbls | 242 | Skins, bales | 2 |
| Peas, bushels | 1,545 | Starch, bxs | 609 |
| Corn-meal, bags | 827 | Tea, hal-chests | 11 |
| Oat-meal, bbls | 100 | Tobacco, hhds | 150 |
| Hemp, bales | 10 | Tobacco, bxs. & cs | 391 |
| Hops, bales | 13 | Whisky, bbls | 560 |
| Hides, bales | 1,608 | Wool, bales | 43 |
| Leather, sides | 7,779 | Sugar, hhds | 228 |
| Lead, pigs | 694 | Sugar, bbds | 9 |
| Spirits Turp., bbls | 363 | Syrup, bbls | 30 |

COTTON—Moderate dealings have been reported for early delivery at essentially unchanged prices. The inquiry has been mainly from spinners and speculators, the department of the foreign exchange market operating against free export purchases. Sales have been reported since our last of 1,683 bales, (of which 205 bales were on last evening,) including 818 bales to spinners and 271 bales to speculators. Of the sales, 150 bales were to arrive. The business for forward delivery has been fair, opening at about steady rates, but subsequently yielding 1-32c.@1-16c. ₱ lb., under the extreme depression in foreign exchange and the comparatively free arrivals at the shipping ports, closing tamely. Sales have been reported since our last of 17,440 bales, (of which 6,300 bales on last evening, and 11,140 bales to-day,) with 5,800 bales more at the call, on the basis of Low Middling, with February options closing at 15 9-16c.@15 19-32c., March at 15 19-32c.@15 5-8c.; April at 15 31-32c.@16c.; May at 16 9-32c.@16 5-16c.; June at 16 19-32c.; July at 16 27-32c.@16 7-8c.; August at 17 1-16c.; September at 16 9-16c. ₱ lb. The receipts here to-day, 3,106 bales, including 961 bales by rail. The receipts at the shipping ports to-day were 15,703 bales, against 16,208 bales same day last week; and thus far this week, 67,085 bales, against 72,852 bales same time last week. The receipts at all the ports since Sept. 1, 1874, have been 2,790,762 bales, against 2,914,956 bales same time the previous year. Consolidated (four days) exports to Great Britain, 25,243 bales; to the Continent, 13,628 bales. Stock in New-York, 173,441 bales; consolidated stocks at the ports, 525,214 bales. The following quotations are based on Cotton according to the new classification:

*New-York Quotations, based on American Standard of Classification.*

| | Uplands. | Alabama. | N. O. | Texas. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ordinary | 12⅞ | 12⅞ | 13 | 13 |
| Good Ordinary | 14⅜ | 14⅜ | 14⅜ | 14⅜ |
| Low Middling | 15⅛ | 15⅛ | 15⅛ | 15⅛ |
| Middling | 15⅞ | 15⅞ | 15⅞ | 15⅞ |
| Good Middling | 16 | 16⅛ | 16⅛ | 16⅛ |
| Middling Fair | 16⅜ | 16⅜ | 16⅜ | 16⅜ |
| Fair | 17⅛ | 17⅛ | 17⅛ | 17⅛ |

FLOUR AND MEAL—A moderate demand prevails for State and Western flours at prices which have been quoted generally steady. Shipping Extras have been bid for rather more freely, but the prices offered for lines have been 10c.@15c. ₱ bbl. under the views of holders, thus retarding operations. The sales since our last have been 9,350 bbls. of all grades, including No. 2 Flour at $3 60@$4 10; inferior to fancy Superfine State and Western at $3 90@$4 35; interior to very good Extra State at $4 40@$4 95, chiefly at $4 70@$4 10; very good to fancy do. and City Mills Extra, $4 95@$6 60; poor to very good shipping extra Western at $4 50@$4 95, mostly at $4 70@$4 90; poor to very good round-hoop Ohio at $4 60@$4 80; fair to choice Minnesota Extra shipping at $4 50@$5 60; and Trade and Family Extras at essentially unchanged figures. Included in the sales have been 3,950 bbls. shipping stock at the current rates.....Rather more doing in the market for Southern Flour, with sales reported of 750 bbls. at previous quotations.....Rye Flour unchanged; sales, 250 bbls.....Cornmeal steady, with more doing; 950 bbls. sold, including 800 bbls. brandywine at $4 75, delivered.

GRAIN—A somewhat better demand has been noted for spring Wheat, mainly on export account, at an improvement of ½c.@1c. ₱ bushel. The inquiry has been mostly for prime No. 2 at the outside figures, at Chicago, afloat, and prime to very choice No. 1 Spring, car stock, delivered. The depression and irregularity in the foreign exchange market, growing out of the peculiar position of the gold speculation, have had a share in the outward movement. Winter Wheat has been held with confidence, on a moderate call for supplies, mostly for prime Red and Amber Western, delivered. Sales have been reported, since our last, of 64,000 bushels at $1 14@$1 20 for ordinary to very choice No. 1 spring; $1 10@$1 12½ for No. 2 Milwaukee Spring, in store and afloat, chiefly at $1 10 for prime in store for shipment, closing with this price, reported as bid; $1 09@$1 10 for No. 2 North-west Spring, in store and afloat; $1 05@$1 08 for No. 2 Chicago Spring, in store and afloat, mostly $1 07@$1 08 for stock afloat, the latter rate for prompt delivery; $1 03@$1 18 for ungraded Spring car stock, mainly at $1 06@$1 13 for ordinary to very good; $1 25 for Amber Western; $1 27@$1 28 for Red do., and $1 25@$1 31 for White do., odd lots.....Rye has been moderately inquired for, and quoted generally firm. The export inquiry has been fair. Sales have been reported since our last of 78,500 bushels at 1c.@82½c. for ordinary to strictly prime new Mixed Western, chiefly at 82c.@82½c. for stock afloat, and closing fully at 82½c. for strictly prime; 82½c.@83c., nearly all at 82½c., for new Yellow Western; 82c.@82½c. for new White do. Old Corn wholly nominal.....Rye very quiet and quoted nominally unchanged.....Barley dull, with little previous inquiry. Very good to choice Canada West quoted at $1 45@$1 50; sales since our last, 4,500 bushels Canada West on private terms, and a car-load of two-rowed State, reported at $1 20 ₱ bushel.....Barley-malt inactive at about former figures. Oats have been in fair demand, chiefly on trade account, at firm prices for stock afloat. Sales have been reported since our last of 70,000 bushels at 50c.@52c. for prime to choice mixed Western, mostly at 51c. to prime Chicago afloat, and 70½c. for Toledo; 76c.@77½c. for White Western; 60½c.@71c. for Mixed State; 70½c.@72c. for White State, car-stock.....Feed has been rather more sought after, within the range of from $20@$21 50 for poor to choice, ₱ ton.....There has been a moderate trade noted in Hay, with shipping grades of Bale Hay quoted at 65c.@75c. for fair to choice, and retailing qualities at 75c.@$1. Clover 55c.@60c. Rye Straw in demand, in a jobbing way, at 45c.@75c. ₱ bale at 2c.@2½c. ₱ 100 lb.

NAVAL STORES—Resin has been offered more freely at rather lower prices, leading to a fair business; sales, 300 bbls. good Strained at $2 10, with Strained to good Strained quoted at $2 05@$2 12½; 2,000 bbls. Strained, to arrive, on private terms; 250 bbls. low No. 2 at $2 20; 200 bbls. low No. 1 at $2 30 ₱ 280 lb. and at Charleston, 1,500 bbls. Strained on private terms. Tar and Pitch quiet at former prices. Spirits Turpentine very quiet at 37½c.@38c. for merchantable; sales, 100 bbls., from dock, at 38c. ₱ gallon.

PETROLEUM—Receivers insist on extreme prices, in view of the advices from the primary markets of the buoyancy there, thus checking business.....Of crude, in bulk, 1,500 bbls., February deliveries, sold at 7¾c. @7¾c., closing with only dealers offered at 7¾c.....Refined from second hands (or refinery) quoted at 14½c., but not active; receivers ask higher figures. At Philadelphia, 5,000 bbls., for early delivery, sold at 14¾c.....Refined, in cases quoted at 19½c.@20½c.....City Naphtha, 10c. ₱ gallon.

PROVISIONS—Pork has been very quiet for early delivery, with prices ruling in favor of buyers. Sales have been reported for early delivery of small lots of New Western Mess at $12 25@$12 50; 200 bbls. Prime Mess, part at $18; with Hall's Prime quoted at $14 50@$15. And for forward delivery, of New Western Mess, 1,000 bbls., May options, at $19 37½@$19 50, closing nail at $19 37½; with March quoted at $19 20, and April at $19 40@$19 50. Beef steady, but firmer and wanted; City quoted at 9c.@9½c.; and Western at 8½c.@8¾c. ₱ lb.....Cut-meats have been in more demand and held rather more firmly, with sales reported of 100 pkgs. Pickled Bellies, in bulk, at 10½c.@10¾c., with Rib Bellies, in bxs., 12 lbs., quoted at 10½c.; 500 Pickled Shoulders, in bulk, at 7½c.; small lots of Pickled Hams at 10½c.@11c.; 600 Smoked Shoulders at 9c.; 1,500 Smoked Hams at 12½c.; 40 bxs. Western Dry-salted Shoulders at 7¾c.; small lots of Western Dry-salted Short-cut Hams, in bxs., 11c., quoted at 10½c.@11c. for 25@25 lb.; and 250 bxs. Western Dry-salted Long-cut Hams on private terms.....Bacon has been in moderate request at steady rates; sales, 195 bxs. City Long Clear at 10¾c.@10¾c., the latter an extreme; 60 bxs. Short Rib at 10½c.; 100 bxs. Western Long Clear at 10½c.; 600 bxs. Long and Short Clear at 10½c., with Short Clear quoted at 10¾c. And for Western delivery, 800 bxs. Cumberland, reported at 9¾c. ₱ lb.....Lard has been quoted firmer through the earlier meetings, on a fairly active movement, but closing dull and a shade off the best prices of the day. Sales have been reported, since our last, for early delivery, of 550 bbls. Western Steam at 13¾c.@13¾c.; 50 bbls. Kettle, to arrive, at 14¾c. for choice; 120 tcs. City Steam at 13¾c.; 250 tcs. Refined, for South America, on private terms, with 13⅞c.@14¼c. quoted as the extremes. And for forward delivery, of Western Steam, 1,000 tcs., February options, at 13½c.@13 15-16c., closing at 13¾c.; 7,250 tcs., March, at 13 15-16c.@14 1-16c., closing at about 14c.; 500 tcs., April, at 14¼c., and 500 tcs., July, at 14¾c., with May quoted at 14¼c.....Beef, steady on a limited business; 100 tcs. City Extra India Mess sold at $17 ₱ tierce.....Butter and Cheese moderately inquired for within the previous range.....Eggs quoted weaker in price, on restricted dealings.

SUGARS—Raws dull and weak at the quotations in our last. Sales, 100 bxs. Clayed at 8c., and 125 bags Mexican at 7¾c. ₱ lb. Refined quiet at about former figures.

TALLOW—Has been quoted steady on sales of equal to 60,000 lb. very good to prime at 8½c.@8⅝c. ₱ lb.....Stearine dull, with prime City, in hhds., quoted at 14½c., and Western, in tcs., at 14¼c. ₱ lb.

WHALEBONE—Has been scarce and quiet at $1 05@$1 10, gold, for Arctic ₱ lb., but without notable activity.

WHISKY—Higher and in fair request; 300 bbls. sold, in lots, at $1 04, and 100 bbls., buyer one week, reported at $1 05 ₱ gallon.

FREIGHTS—More activity has been noted in the line of berth freights, with rates quoted stronger for Grain room, which has been more urgently sought after, especially by steam for Liverpool. The somewhat milder weather favored the freer transportation of Produce in the harbor and tended to stimulate shipments. The extreme depression in foreign exchange, however, seriously interfered with the execution of export orders. Cotton was moving slowly. Provisions were offering more freely. The chartering business was comparatively quiet, but rates were without important alteration. Tonnage for petroleum, Cotton and Grain was in demand, but the bids were not satisfactory to ship owners, and negotiations were making slow progress.....For Liverpool the engagements reported, since our last, have been, by sail, 75 bbls. Oil at 32c. 6d. ₱ ton, and by steam, 400,000 bushels Grain, including 16,000 bushels (additional last evening) at 7d.@7¼d.; 16,000 bushels Wheat at 7¾d., and 8,000 bushels Grain at 7¾d. ₱ standard bushel, closing with 7¾d. reported as bid for room for Corn, and up to 8d. asked; 3,500 pkgs. Provisions, in sundry lots, at 27s. 6d.@ 30s.; 70 tons Leather at 50s. ₱ ton; 350 bbls. Apples at 4s. ₱ bbl.; 250 pkgs. Provisions on the basis of 7s. ₱ tierce, and 700 bales Cotton, reported at ¼d.@9-32d. ₱ lb., closing at 9-32d. as the current quotation, (with engagements for 300 bales, made early, reported as canceled;) also two barks, 700 and 670 tons, with Cotton from Charleston, reported at 7-16d. ₱ lb., with option of Havre; and a ship, with Cotton from New-Orleans, reported at ½d. ₱ lb.....For London, by sail, 1,500 bbls. Flour at 2s. 4½d. ₱ bbl.; and, by steam, 32,000 bushels Wheat, at 9d. ₱ bushel, and 450 pkgs. Seed at 40s. ₱ ton.....For Glasgow, by steam, 1,000 bbls. Flour, reported on private terms, and 150 tons Provisions, in lots, at 35s.@37s. 6d. ₱ ton.....For Bristol, by steam, 1,000 bbls. Flour at 3s. ₱ bbl.....For the United Kingdom some inquiry was noted for vessels to load with Phosphates at Charleston on the basis of 27s. 6d., but higher rates were claimed; also, with Naval Stores, at the same port, at 4s. 9d.@5s. for Resin, ₱ 310 lbs; and 6s. 9d.@7s. for Spirits Turpentine, ₱ 40 gallons, with privileges extending to the Continent.....For Havre, a ship, with Cotton, reported from New-Orleans, at 1c. ₱ lb.....For Hamburg, by steam, 2,500 Wet-salted Hides, at equal to 37s. 6d., and 2,500 sides Leather at 72s. 6d.....For Bremen, a German brig, 249 tons, hence, with Provisions, reported at 32s. 6d. per ton.....For Rotterdam, by steam, 250 bales Cotton, at 5c. ₱ lb., with Grain room quoted at about 9d. ₱ bushel.....For Stettin, by steam, (via Hamburg,) 450 tcs. Lard, reported at equal to 60s. ₱ ton.....For Fernambuco or Bahia, an American brig, 259 tons, hence, with general cargo, reported on the basis of $1 10 ₱ bbl.....For the River Plate, a British bark, 375 tons, with Lumber, from Brunswick, reported at $21 50, an advance.....For the north side of Cuba, direct, a schooner, 178 tons, with Shooks, reported from St. John, at 16c.....For Progreso, an American brig, 297 tons, hence, with Railroad Iron, reported at $8 50, and back with Mahogany, &c., on private terms.....For Matanzas, and orders, a brig, 292 tons, with Shooks, reported from St. John, at 17c.....For Baltimore, an American schooner, 168 tons, with Sugar and Molasses, from Demerara, reported at $4 and $3; and a schooner, with Lumber, from Pascagoula, at $9, with option of Philadelphia, or $10 for Boston.....For a port north of Hatteras, a British brig, 148 tons, with Molasses, from Demerara, reported at $2 75; and an American schooner, with Salt, from Cadiz, reported at 11½c. ₱ bushel.....For Key West a brig, with Coal, from Baltimore, reported at $2 50 ₱ ton.....For Boston, a schooner, with Lumber, from Pensacola, at $9.....For Providence, a schooner, with Lumber, from Pascagoula, reported at $8.....For Bath, a schooner, with Lumber, from Wilmington, at $6.....For New-York, a schooner, with Lumber, from Brunswick, at $6 25; and another, with do., from Savannah, at about $8.

## THE STATE OF TRADE.

CHICAGO, Feb. 17.—Flour quiet and unchanged. Wheat in fair demand and higher; No. 2 Spring, 83¾c. @83¾c. spot; 84¾c., March; 85¾c., April; 90c., May; No. 3 do., 80c.@80¼c.; rejected, 77½c.@78c. Corn—Demand light; holders firm; prices higher; No. 2 Mixed, 42¾c.@43c., spot; 43¼c., March; 44c., April; rejected, 42c.; Ear, 47½c.@48c. Oats active and higher; No. 2, 53⅜c. bid, spot; 53c., March; 56½c., May. Rye advanced, and in fair demand; No. 2, 99c. @$1. Barley dull and drooping; No. 2 Spring, $1 09½ spot or March; $1 08 April. Seeds quiet and weak. Dressed Hogs active and higher; light weights, $7 75@$7 80; heavy at $8@$8 25. Pork in good demand at $18 25@$18 37½, spot or March; $18 12½@$18 37½ April. Lard in good demand at $13 50, spot; $13 55@$13 57½, March; $13 75, April. Bulk Meats dull and declining; Shoulders, 6½c.@6¾c.; Short Rib Middles, 9c.@9⅜c.; Short Clear do., 9¾c., all loose. Whisky dull and declining at $1 04. Receipts—Flour, 9,000 bbls.; Wheat, 65,000 bushels; Corn, 31,000 bushels; Oats, 8,000 bushels; Barley, 4,000 bushels. Shipments—Flour, 6,000 bbls.; Wheat, 40,000 bushels; Corn, 29,000 bushels; Oats, 11,000 bushels; Barley, 8,000 bushels. At the afternoon call of the board Wheat was ½c. lower. Corn easier, unchanged. Oats easier, unchanged. Pork and Lard unchanged.

BALTIMORE, Feb. 17.—Flour quiet and unchanged. Wheat dull and weak; No. 1 Amber Western, $1 20@$1 21; No. 2 do., $1 17@$1 18; No. 3 do., $1 13@$1 14; No. 1 Red Western, $1 18@$1 19; No. 2 do., $1 16; No. 3 do. $1 12; Red Pennsylvania, $1 18; Red Maryland, $1 16@$1 20; Amber do., $1 20@$1 25. White do., $1 10@$1 25. Corn quiet; White Southern, 78c.@80c.; Yellow do., 78c.@80c.; Mixed Western, 77c. Oats firm; Southern, 67c.@68c.; White Western, 67c.@68c.; Mixed do., 65c.@66c. Rye firm at $1 01@1 03. Hay dull; Pennsylvania and Maryland, $17@$20. Provisions quiet and easier. Pork nominally $19 25@$20. Bulk Meats firm; Shoulders, 7¼c.@7¾c.; Clear Rib Sides, 10c.@10½c. Bacon steady; Shoulders, 8½c.; Clear Rib Sides, 11½c.@11¾c. Hams, 14c.@15c. Lard nominally 13¾c.@14½c. Butter steady; Western Tubs, 24c.@30c.; do. Rolls, 21c.@26c. Petroleum excited and higher at 78c.@79c. Coffee steady; good to prime Rio ranges nominally 18½c.@19½c. Whisky quiet; unsettled; nominally $1 05.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 17.—Flour quiet and weak; Superfine, $3 50@$3 75; Wisconsin and Minnesota Extra Family, $4 87½@$5 50; Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Ohio do., $5 25@$6; high grades, $6 25@$7 25. Wheat dull and weak; Red, $1 17@$1 19; Amber, $1 20; White, $1 29. Rye, 95c. Corn held firmly; Yellow 73c.; Mixed Western, 78½. Oats in limited demand; White, 66c.@68c. Pork steady at $19 50@$20. Lard firm. Quercitron Bark, No. $33. Seed—Clover scarce; firmly held; State 10¾c.@10¾c.; Western, 11c.@11¾c.; Timothy, $2 60@$2 75; Flax, $2. Butter steady; New York State and Pennsylvania, County Extras, 35c.@37c.; do. Choice, 33c.@35c.; Western Extras, 28c.@30c.; do. Firsts, 24c. @27c.; do. Rolls, Firsts, 25c.@27c. Cheese firm; New-York Fancy, 16¼c.@17c. Eggs firm; State, New-Jersey and Delaware, fresh, 42c.@43c.; Western, 39c.@ 41c. Petroleum firm; Refined, 14c., February; 14¼c., March; Crude, 10½c. Whisky—Western iron-bound, nominally, $1 08.

ST. LOUIS, Feb. 17.—Flour declining, with a good demand for low and medium grades; Superfine Winter, $4 10@$4 20; Extra do., $4 25@$4 35; double Extra, $4 40@$4 50. Wheat dull and unchanged. Corn firmer at 63½c.@65c. Oats irregular and higher at 55½c.@57½c. Barley dull and declining. No. 2 Spring, $1 07@$1 08. Rye in good demand and scarce at $1 03@$1 05. Whisky declining; opened at $1 07; closed at $1 02. Pork quiet at $18 50, cash or February. Lard quiet. Bulk Meats quiet; Shoulders, 6c.@6¼c.; Clear Rib Sides, 9¾c.@9¾c.; Clear Sides, 10½c. Bacon firm; Shoulders, 8½c.@8¾c.; Clear Rib Sides, 10¾c.@11c.; Clear Sides, 11¾c.@11¾c. Lard declining, at 13¾. Live Hogs, firmer; Packers, $6@$6 50; light to heavy, $6 25@$6 50@$7 50. Cattle firm for best grades; fair Native Steers, $5 25@$5 35; Good, $5 75; common Native Butchers, $4 75; good Shippers, $5 50@$5 75; good Texans, $4 50. Receipts—2,000 bbls. Flour, 7,000 bushels Wheat, 39,000 bushels Corn, 11,000 bushels Oats, 2,000 bushels Barley, 3,000 Hogs.

NEW-ORLEANS, Feb. 17.—Flour—A moderate local trade; Double Extra, $4 90; other grades unchanged. Corn in fair demand; Yellow and White, 86c.; Mixed, 85c. Oats firmer at 71c.@72c. Bran—A small supply just in; not yet sold. Hay dull; prime, $25. Pork dull at $20. Dry-salted Meats dull; Shoulders, 7¾c.@7½c.; Clear Rib and Clear Sides, 11½c. and 10½c. Bacon higher; Shoulders, 8½c.@ 8¾c.; Clear Rib sides, 11¾c.@11¾c.; Clear Sides, 11¾c. @12¾c. Hams dull at 13¾c. Lard dull; Tierce, Packers', 14c.; Refined, 14¾c.; Keg, 14¾c.@15c. Sugar unchanged; light supply. Molasses unchanged; supply only of poor quality. Coffee unchanged. Whisky dull and declining; Louisiana offered at $1 09. Corn-meal quiet at $3. Exchange—New-York Sight, par@¼ premium; Sterling, 9½. Gold, 11¼.

MILWAUKEE, Feb. 17.—Flour quiet and unchanged. Wheat in fair demand; firm; No. 1 Milwaukee, 90½c.; No. 2 do., 80½c.; March, 85¾c.; April, 86½c. Corn quiet but firm; new, in store, 63¾c. Oats firm; No. 2, in store, 51¼c. Rye declining; quiet; No. 1, in store, 87½c. Barley easier; No. 2 Spring, March, $1 14½; No. 3 do., in store, $1. Provisions a shade firmer. Mess Pork, $18 10, cash; $18 25 March; Prime Mess, $16 50; Extra Prime Pork, $13; Sweet Pickled Hams, 10¼c.@ 11c. Dry-salted Meats—Shoulders, 5½c.; Long Clear middles, 9¾c.@10¾c., loose; Boxed Meats, ¼c. higher. Prime Lard strong; Steam, 13¾c.@13⅝c.; Kettle, 14c. Receipts—Flour, 3,500 bbls.; Wheat, 23,000 bushels. Shipments—Flour, 5,500 bbls.; Wheat, 25,000 bushels.

CINCINNATI, Feb. 17.—Flour dull. Wheat dull; Red, $1 08@$1 10. Corn in fair demand at 68c. Oats quiet and steady at 50c.@55c. Rye steady at $1 09. Barley dull and unchanged. Butter firmer but not quotably higher. Lower-seed steady at 11¾c.@12c. Pork steady at $19. Lard steady at $13 56½@$13 60 for steam; $14 25@$14 50 for Kettle. Bulk Meats steady; Shoulders, 6¾c.@7¼c.; Clear Rib Sides, 9¾c. @10c.; Clear Sides, 10¾c.@10¾c. Bacon steady; Shoulders, 7¾c.@8¼c.; Clear Rib Sides, 10¾c.@11c.; Clear Sides, 11¾c.@11¾c. Whisky firm at $1. Live Hogs quiet but firm for good grades; common dull at $6 25@$6 45; fair to good shipping, $6 50@$6 87½; choice, $7 40@$7 50. The bulk of the sales were at $6 80@$7 15. Receipts, 2,200.

BOSTON, Feb. 17.—FLOUR—Demand quite limited; prices without improvement; Western Superfine, $4 50@$5; common Winters, $4 50@$5; Wisconsin and Minnesota do., $5@$6 25; White Wheat Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, $5 50@$6 50; Illinois, $5 50@$7; St. Louis, $5 75@$8; Southern Flour quiet at $4 50@$8; Fancy Minnesota, $7@$9. Corn quite firm; Mixed and Yellow, 86c.@86½c.; Oats in demand at 70c.@73c. Rye, 95c.@$1. Shorts, $30@$31; Fine Feed and Middlings, $31@$32. Receipts—Flour, 3,455 bbls.; Corn, 11,600 bushels; Wheat, 6,975 bushels; Oats, 1,750 bushels; Barley, 700 bushels. Lumber, 1,975 bundles.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., Feb. 17.—Flour and Wheat unchanged. Corn nominally, 68c.@70c. Oats firm at 62c.@64c. Rye quiet at $1 10. Pork quiet at $19 75@$20. Bacon firm; Shoulders, 8¼c.; Clear Rib and Clear Sides, 11¾c.@11¾c. Bulk Meats in fair demand, firm; Shoulders, 7¾c.; Clear Rib and Clear Sides, 10¾c.@10¾c.; Sugar-cured Hams, 13¾c.@14c. Prime Lard—Strained, 14c.@14¼c.; Tierce, 14¾c.@14¾c.; Keg, 15¾c. Whisky declining at $1. Bagging quiet at 12¾c.

BUFFALO, N. Y., Feb. 17.—Receipts—3,000 bbls. Flour, 10,000 bushels Wheat, 22,000 bushels Corn, 5,000 bushels Oats, 2,000 bushels Barley. Shipments—3,000 bbls. Flour, 10,000 bushels Wheat, 16,000 bushels Corn, 5,000 bushels Oats, 2,000 bushels Barley. Grain and Flour unchanged. Corn very dull and firm; sales of 3 cars new at 75c., on the track. Oats, Rye, and Barley neglected. Mess Pork, Lard, and Dressed Hogs without change. Highwines nominally $1 09.

OSWEGO, Feb. 17.—Flour dull, owing to the storm. Sales at 60 for No. 1 Spring; $6 25 for Amber Winter; $6 50 for White Winter, and $6 75 for Double Extra. Wheat unchanged. Corn, quiet at 87c. Barley weak; Prime Canada off red at $1 40. Corn-meal, Boited $3 75; Unbolted $3 50. Mill-feed steady; Shorts $26; Shipstuffs $27; Middlings $30.

DETROIT, Feb. 17.—Flour and Wheat unchanged. Corn firm, in fair demand, at 68½c. Oats quiet, unchanged. Clover-seed, $6 30@$6 40 asked; $6 15@ $6 20 bid. Receipts—Flour, 1,000 bbls.; Corn, 4,000 bushels. Shipments—Flour, 1,000 bbls.; Wheat, 6,000 bushels; Corn, 2,000 bushels.

MEMPHIS, Feb. 17.—Flour in fair demand, firm, unchanged. Corn, market bare. Oats dull and drooping at 70c. Pork, none here. Lard quiet, unchanged. Bulk Meats firm, in fair demand; Shoulders, 7¼c.@ 7½c.; Clear Rib and Clear Sides, 10¼c.@10¾c.

## THE COTTON MARKETS.

GALVESTON, Feb. 17.—Cotton dull and nominally unchanged; Middling, 15c.; net receipts, 1,544 bales; gross, 1,574; exports to the Continent, 1,300 bales; coastwise, 1,121 bales; sales, 259 bales; stock, 72,837 bales.

CHARLESTON, Feb. 17.—Cotton dull; Middling, 15c.; Low Middling, 14¾c.@14¾c.; Good Ordinary, 13¾c.@14c.; net receipts, 1,134 bales; exports to Great Britain, 2,700 bales; coastwise, 155 bales; sales, 800 bales; stock, 50,322 bales.

NEW-ORLEANS, Feb. 17.—Cotton—Demand good; Middling, 15c.; Low Middling, 14¾c.; Good Ordinary, 13¾c.; net receipts, 4,874 bales; gross, 5,394 bales; exports to France, 1,660 bales; to the Continent, 4,980 bales; sales, 7,000 bales; stock, 293,908 bales.

SAVANNAH, Feb. 17.—Cotton quiet; Middling, 15c.; Low Middling, 14¾c.; Good Ordinary, 13¾c.; net receipts, 2,862 bales; exports to Great Britain, 4,927 bales; sales, 900 bales; stock, 104,752 bales.

MOBILE, Feb. 17.—Cotton quiet; Middling, 14¾c.@ 14¾c.; net receipts, 2,629 bales; exports to Great Britain, 433 bales; to France, 1,300 bales; coastwise, 2,104 bales; sales, 750 bales; stock, 66,434 bales.

## FOREIGN MARKETS.

LONDON, Feb. 17—12:30 P. M.—Consols for money, 92¾@92⅞; and for the account, 92⅞@93. Erie Railway Shares, 25¼.

5 P. M.—The amount of bullion withdrawn from the Bank of England on balance to-day is £60,000. Paris dispatches quote Rentes at 64f. 65c.

LIVERPOOL, Feb. 17—12:30 P. M.—Cotton—The market is dull and unchanged; Middling Uplands, 7¾d.; Middling Orleans, 7¾d. Sales, 12,000 bales, including 3,000 bales for speculation and export.

2 P. M.—Cotton—Of the sales to-day 6,400 bales were American; sales on the basis of Middling Uplands, nothing below Low Middling, deliverable April and May, at 7¾d. Breadstuffs—The market is quiet. Provisions—Bacon, 43s. 9d. ₱ cwt. for Short Clear Middles. Produce—Tallow, 40s. 6d. ₱ cwt.

5 P. M.—Cotton—sales on the basis of Middling Uplands, nothing below Good Ordinary, shipped January, at 7 11-16d.; do., nothing below Low Middling, shipped January, at 7 13-16d.; do., do., shipped February and March, at 7 13-16d.; do., do., deliverable February and March, at 7¾d.

LONDON, Feb. 17.—Refined Petroleum, 11d. ₱ gallon. Evening.—Linseed-oil, 25s. ₱ cwt.

## LAW REPORTS.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY.

COURT OF APPEALS.

ALBANY, Feb. 17.—The following is the Court of Appeals day calendar for Feb. 18: Nos. 128, 117, 87, 118, 40, 12, 119, 127.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.

*Held by Lawrence, J.*

| Nos. | | Nos. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6— | N. Y. & R. Cement Co. vs. Hawkins, &c. | 168— | Knapp vs. Alden. |
| 30— | Chapin vs. Dobson. | 184— | Sadler vs. Hyatt. |
| 32— | Devoe vs. Harison. | 189— | Achesou vs. Achesou. |
| 71— | The People, &c., vs. Standard Uniondig. Co. | 196— | Manning vs. Mathews, &c. |
| 79— | Mercantile Nat. Bank vs. Bloss S. M. Co. | 199— | Agramonte vs. Nason. |
| 80— | Haight, &c., vs. N. Y. Elevated R. Co. | 218— | Mayer, &c., vs. Haviland, &c. |
| 152— | Erie Railway Co. vs. Gould. | 220— | Roe vs. Hall. |
| 168— | Bainbridge vs. Berne, &c. | 227— | Phyfe vs. Cook, &c. |
| | | 230— | Welles vs. Bourquit, &c. |
| | | 231— | Balny vs. Lyddy. |

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

*Held by Van Vorst, J.*

| Nos. Issues of Law and Fact | Nos. | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 156— | Muller vs. Burchell et al. | 191— | Cheesebrough vs. Daly et al. |
| 60— | Kelly, Sheriff, &c. vs. Whiting et al. | 192— | Same vs. Same. |
| 109— | Nast vs. Kemp. | 193— | Gilbert et al. vs. Daly et al. |
| 54— | Beach vs. Collis, Jr. et al. | 194— | Same vs. Same. |
| 174— | Riggs et al. vs. Pursell et al. | 195— | Same vs. Same. |
| 175— | Stuart vs. Clarke et al. | 196— | Vermilye vs. Post et al. |
| 178— | Koehler vs. Strappers et al. | 199— | Simpson vs. Union Pacific Railroad Co. et al. |
| 330— | Palmer et al. vs. Dixon et al. | 200— | Michebacher vs. Gottgetren, imp'd. |
| 179— | Brody vs. Brody. | 201— | Esty vs. Wade et al. |
| 99— | Harte vs. De Witt. | 202— | Mason vs. Russell. |
| 78— | Foley vs. Green, &c. | 203— | Connor, Sheriff, &c., vs. G. R. Coal and Iron Co. et al. |
| 159— | Odell vs. Odell. | 204— | Totten vs. Totten. |
| 130— | Schuster vs. Hudson et al. | | |

SUPREME COURT—CIRCUIT—PART II.

*Held by Van Brunt, J.*

| Nos. | | Nos. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 462— | St. Nicholas National Bank vs. Nat. Bank of the State of New-York. | 964— | Nelson, Jr., vs. The Mayor, &c. |
| | | 918— | Miller et al. vs. Brenham, imp'd. &c. |
| 998— | Brown vs. Peters et al. | 1293— | Whittemore vs. The Mayor, &c. |
| 672— | Kelly, Adm'r, &c., vs. N. Y. R. R. & T. Co. et al. | 1142— | Carlisle et al. vs. N. Y. W. & B. R. R. Co. |
| 1030— | Weeks vs. N. Y., N. H. & H. R. R. Co. | 1144— | Stinson vs. Crawford. |
| 680— | Cheseman vs. Long Island R. R. Co. | 1146— | Cunningham vs. The Mayor, &c. |
| 184— | Quassaick Nat. Bank of Newburg vs. Waddell. | 1148— | Smith vs. Hodges. |
| 714— | Macfarland vs. H. & N. Y. S. B. Co. | 1150— | Hart vs. Witkowski. |
| 1108— | Alexander et al. vs. Cauldwell et al. | 1152— | Malloy et al. vs. Stradley. |
| 1120— | Martin, Ex'r, &c. vs. Hicks. | 1154— | Cunningham et al. vs. Gibson et al. |
| 1640— | Organ vs. The Mayor, &c. | 1156— | Miller vs. Miller. |
| 1306— | Robinson vs. Brennan, Sheriff, &c. | 1158— | Hanlon vs. Bradley. |
| | | 1162— | Goodsell vs. Pierce, [unpleaded, &c. |
| | | 1164— | Richardson et al. vs. Dart et al. |

SUPREME COURT—CIRCUIT—PART III.

*Held by Donohue, J.*

| Nos. | | Nos. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 879— | Smith vs. Rytten-berg. | 912— | Iselin vs. The Mayor, &c. |
| 1445— | The Mayor, &c., vs. Genet. | 915— | Kennedy et al. vs. The Mayor, &c. |
| 1119— | Sloats vs. The Mayor, &c. | 2337— | Murphy et al. vs. The Mayor, &c. |
| 823— | Levi et al. vs. Morrissania S. B. Co. | 6351/2— | Gallagher et al. |
| 861— | Platt vs. Stuart et al. | 2329— | Masterson vs. The Mayor et al. |
| 877— | Atwill vs. De Mott. | 1003— | Kenat et al. vs. Derr et al. |
| 929— | Agate vs. Burns. | 2241— | Woods vs. The Mayor, &c. |
| 1055— | Warm vs. Ashley. | 2251— | Ford vs. The Mayor, &c. |
| 2117— | Bigler et al. vs. The Mayor, &c. | 855— | Oberman vs. World Mut. Life Ins. Co. |
| 2119— | Same vs. Same. | 917— | Paris, Survr., &c., vs. Fargo, President, &c. |
| 1063— | Platt, Rec'r, vs. Van Orden. | 93— | Hubbell vs. Gt. W. Ins. Co. |
| 847— | Ward vs. Rosenwald et al. | | |
| 797— | Brown C. G. Co. vs. Lewis et al. | | |
| 77— | St. Nich. Ins. Co. vs. Mut. Mut. F. & M. Ins. Co. | | |

SUPERIOR COURT—TRIAL TERM—PART I.

*Held by Sprir, J.*

| Nos. | | Nos. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 557— | Sutro et al. vs. Fargo, President, &c. | 905— | Rhodes vs. McCurdy. |
| 875— | Perro vs. Haberle. | 907— | Sanford et al. vs. McGuire. |
| 653— | Furlong vs. Allen. | 909— | Cyrus vs. Paris. |
| 739— |

## SHIPPING.

### WHITE STAR LINE,
FOR QUEENSTOWN AND LIVERPOOL, CARRYING UNITED STATES MAILS.

NEW AND FULL-POWERED STEAM-SHIPS,
Sailing from New-York on SATURDAYS, from Liverpool on THURSDAYS, calling at Cork Harbor each way.
BELGIC.....SATURDAY, Feb. 20, at 3 P. M.
ADRIATIC.....SATURDAY, Feb. 27, at 10 A. M.
CELTIC.....SATURDAY, March 6, at 3 P. M.
REPUBLIC.....SATURDAY, March 13, at 10 A. M.

From White Star Dock, Pier No. 52 North River.

These steamers, the fastest in the trade, are uniform in size and unsurpassed in appointments. The saloon, staterooms, smoking and bath rooms are amidships where the noise and motion are least, affording a degree of comfort hitherto unattainable at sea.

Rates—Saloon, $80, gold; return tickets, $140, gold; steerage at low rates. For sailings after February the saloon rates will be $80 and $100, gold.

Drafts from £1 upward.

For inspection of plans and other information apply at the Company's offices, No. 19 Broadway, New-York.

R. J. CORTIS, Agent.

### CUNARD LINE B. & N. A. R. M. S P. CO.
NOTICE.

With the view of diminishing the chances of collision, the steamers of this line take a specified course for all seasons of the year

On the outward passage from Queenstown to New-York or Boston, crossing meridian of 50 at 43 latitude, or nothing to the north of 43.

On the homeward passage, crossing the meridian of 50 at 42, or nothing to the north of 42.

FROM NEW-YORK FOR LIVERPOOL AND QUEENSTOWN.

ABYSSINIA...WED., Feb. 17 ALGERIA...WED., March 3
PARTHIA....WED., Feb. 24 CUBA.....WED., March 17

Steamers marked * do not carry steerage passengers.

Cabin passage, $80, $100, and $130, gold, according to accommodation. Return tickets on favorable terms.

Steerage tickets to and from all parts of Europe at current rates. Freight and cabin office, No. 4 Bowling Green. Steerage office, No. 111 Broadway, (Trinity Building.) CHAS. G. FRANCKLYN, Agent.

### ONLY DIRECT LINE TO FRANCE.
THE GENERAL TRANSATLANTIC COMPANY'S MAIL STEAM-SHIPS BETWEEN NEW-YORK AND HAVRE.

The splendid vessels on this favorite route for the Continent (being more southerly than any other) will sail from Pier No. 50 North River, as follows:

PEREIRE, Dainese.....SATURDAY, Feb. 20
FRANCE, Trudelle.....SATURDAY, March 6
VILLE DE PARIS, Lachesnet.....SATURDAY, March 20

PRICE OF PASSAGE IN GOLD, (including wine.)
First Cabin, $100. Second, $65.
Third cabin and steerage at lower rates.

American travelers, by taking this line, avoid both transit by English railway and the discomforts of crossing the Channel, besides saving time, trouble, and expense. GEORGE MACKENZIE, Agent, No. 55 Broadway.

### TO LET OR LEASE,
THE SPACIOUS

## Lofts of No. 341 Broadway,

Building formerly occupied by Phton & Co., with an L extension on Leonard st., with steam elevator and heating apparatus; immediate possession. Apply to HORACE S. ELY, No. 22 Pine st.

### NATIONAL LINE.
From Piers Nos. 44 and 47 North River.
TO QUEENSTOWN AND LIVERPOOL

Erin.....Feb. 16, 11 A. M. The Queen..March 6, 3 P.M
Italy.....Feb. 20, 3 P. M.

FOR LONDON DIRECT.

France.....Saturday Feb. 27, 10 A. M.

Cabin passage, $80 and $70, currency. Steerage at greatly reduced price. Return tickets at reduced rates. Prepaid steerage tickets from Liverpool at the lowest rates. Apply at the company's office, No. 69 Broadway.

F. C. MINTURN, Jr., Agent.

### INMAN LINE.—SOUTHERLY COURSE.
Royal Mail Steamers are appointed to sail as follows:

FOR QUEENSTOWN AND LIVERPOOL.
CITY OF ANTWERP....Thursday, Feb. 18, at 2 P. M.
CITY OF CHESTER....Saturday, Feb. 20, at 3 P. M.
CITY OF BROOKLYN....Saturday, Feb. 27, at 10 A. M.
CITY OF NEW-YORK....Saturday, March 6, at 3 P. M.
CITY OF LONDON.....Saturday, March 13, at noon.

CABIN PASSAGE, $80, $100, and $130, gold.
STEERAGE.—To and from all points, at reduced rates.

Cabin and general office, No. 15 Broadway.
Steerage offices, No. 33 Broadway, and Pier No. 45 North River. JOHN G. DALE, Agent.

### ANCHOR LINE.
NEW-YORK AND GLASGOW.
STEAMER EVERY SATURDAY.
RATES OF PASSAGE, PAYABLE IN GOLD,
TO GLASGOW, LIVERPOOL, LONDONDERRY, OR BELFAST:
Cabin, $50, $60, and $70, according to accommodations.
INTERMEDIATE AND STEERAGE
as low as by any other first-class line.

Drafts issued for any amount at lowest rates.
Company's offices, No. 7 Bowling Green.
HENDERSON BROTHERS, Agents.

### NORTH GERMAN LLOYD STEAM-SHIP CO.
FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The steam-ship NECKAR, Capt. J. C. Meier, will sail on SATURDAY, Feb. 20, at 2 P. M., from Bremen Pier, foot 2d st., Hoboken, to be followed by steam-ship DEUTSCHLAND, Capt W. Ladewig, on SATURDAY, Feb. 27.

RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND BREMEN.
First cabin.....$100 gold.
Second cabin.....60 gold.
Steerage.....24 currency.

For freight or passage apply to OELRICHS & CO., Agents, No. 2 Bowling green.

### FOR ST. THOMAS AND BRAZIL.
THE UNITED STATES AND BRAZIL MAIL STEAM-SHIP COMPANY.

Regular mail steamers SAILING 23D OF EVERY MONTH, making close connections at RIO DE JANEIRO with the English and French Mail Steam-ships at MONTEVIDEO and BUENOS AYRES.

The splendid iron steam-ship SOUTH AMERICA, Capt. F. L. Tinsleaven, will sail from PIER No. 43 NORTH RIVER, on MONDAY, Feb. 22, at 9 o'clock A. M., calling at ST. THOMAS, PARA, PERNAMBUCO, BAHIA, and RIO DE JANEIRO, going and returning.

First cabin passage to St. Thomas, $100; to Para, $150; to Pernambuco, $200; to Bahia, $210, and to Rio de Janeiro, $225, gold. Steerage half price. EXCURSION TICKETS, good for six months, at three-quarters of above rates. Freights greatly reduced.

Direct communication to St. Croix, via St. Thomas.

Apply to WM. R. GARRISON, No. 5 Bowling green.

### FOR SAVANNAH, GA.,
THE FLORIDA PORTS,
AND THE SOUTH AND SOUTH-WEST.

GREAT SOUTHERN FREIGHT AND PASSENGER LINE, CENTRAL RAILROAD OF GEORGIA AND ATLANTIC AND GULF RAILROAD.
WEDNESDAYS AND SATURDAYS.

SAN JACINTO, Capt. Hazard, SATURDAY, Feb. 20, from Pier No. 43 North River, at 3 P. M.
WM. R. GARRISON, Agent, No. 5 Bowling Green.

GULF STREAM, Capt. Faircloth, WEDNESDAY, Feb. 24, from Pier No. 12, North River, at 3 P. M.
R. LOWDEN, Agent, No. 93 West st.

SAN SALVADOR, Capt. Nickerson, SATURDAY, Feb. 27, from Pier No. 43 North River, at 3 P. M.
WILLIAM R. GARRISON, Agent, No. 5 Bowling Green.

CLEOPATRA, Capt. Bulkley, WEDNESDAY, March 3, Pier No. 16 East River, at 3 P. M.
MURRAY, FERRIS & CO., Agents, No. 62 South st.

Insurance by this line ONE HALF PER CENT.
Superior accommodation for passengers.
Through rates and bills of lading in connection with Central Railroad of Georgia, to all points.
Through rates and bills of lading in connection with the Atlantic and Gulf Railroad and Florida steamers.
GEORGE YONGE, Agent, Central Railroad of Georgia, No. 409 Broadway.

### GREAT SOUTHERN FREIGHT AND PASSENGER LINE
FOR CHARLESTON, S. C.,
THE FLORIDA PORTS,
AND THE
SOUTH AND SOUTH-WEST,
SEMI-WEEKLY, EVERY WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY AT 3 P. M.,
from Pier No. 29 North River.

CHAMPION, Capt. R. W. Lockwood, Saturday, Feb. 20.
GEORGIA, Capt. S. Crowell, Wednesday, Feb. 24.

Superior accommodations for passengers.
Insurance by this line ONE-HALF PER CENT.
Goods forwarded free of commission.
Passage tickets and bills of lading issued and signed at the office of
JAMES W. QUINTARD & CO., Agents,
No. 177 West st., (corner of Warren,)
Or W. P. CLYDE & CO.,
No. 6 Bowling green.

Through freight tariffs. Passage tickets by all routes and to all points in the South and South-west, and further information can be obtained at the office of
BENTLEY D. HASELL,
General Agent Great Southern Freight Line,
No. 317 Broadway.

### ATLAS MAIL LINE.
BI-MONTHLY SERVICE TO HAYTI, VENEZUELA, CURACOA, MARACAIBO, JAMAICA, AND COLUMBIA.

First-class, full-powered iron screw steamers, from Pier No. 51 North River.

NASSAU, KINGSTON, and COLUMBIA.
ALPS.....Feb. 23.
ETNA.....March 13.
HAYTI.
ANDES.....Feb. 25.
HAYTI, VENEZUELA and CURACOA.
ATLAS.....March 4.

PIM, FORWOOD & CO., Agents, No. 56 Wall and No. 59 Pine st.

### NEW-YORK AND HAVANA DIRECT MAIL LINE.
These first-class steam-ships will sail at 3 P. M., from Pier No. 13 North River, (foot of Cedar st.,) for Havana direct, as follows:

COLUMBUS, Capt. E. C. Reed, Tuesday, Feb. 23.
CRESCENT CITY, Capt. Curtis Thursday, March 4.

For freight or passage (having unsurpassed accommodations) apply to WM. P. CLYDE & CO., No. 6 Bowling green.

McKellar, Luling & Co., agents in Havana.

### METROPOLITAN STEAM-SHIP COMPANY.
To shippers of freight between New-York and Boston: During the continuance of the ice blockade on Long Island Sound, the steamers of the Metropolitan Steam-ship Company will, at the discretion of the Masters, pass outside the Sound, thus avoiding the present delays and dangers of Sound navigation. All the steamers of this line are first-class, sea-going steamers, freight received daily at the company's pier, No. 11 North River, and forwarded promptly.

H. F. DIMOCK, Agent Metropolitan Steam-ship Company.

### NOTICE TO TRAVELERS.
Families or gentlemen going to travel on the Continent of Europe, who can afford the expense of a courier, should never leave Paris without one. Their services are invaluable in relieving the traveler from multiplicity of cares and troubles respecting passports, examination and conveyance of luggage, in securing the best accommodation, in protecting the traveler from imposition, and an infinity of annoyances to which they are exposed in various parts of the Continent. Competent and trustworthy couriers and traveling servants may always be obtained by applying to the COURIER SOCIETY, No. 5 Rue d'Alger, near the Tuileries Garden, Paris

## SHIPPING.

### FOR LIVERPOOL,
(VIA QUEENSTOWN,)
CARRYING THE UNITED STATES MAILS.

THE LIVERPOOL AND GREAT WESTERN STEAM COMPANY will dispatch one of their first-class full-power iron screw steam-ships from
PIER NO. 46 NORTH RIVER, EVERY TUESDAY, as follows:
WISCONSIN, Capt. Freeman.....Feb. 16, at 2 P. M.
IDAHO, Capt. Forsyth.....March 2, at 1 P. M.

Cabin passage, $80, gold.
Steerage passage, (Office No. 29 B'way,) at low rates.
For freight or cabin passage apply to
WILLIAMS & GUION, No. 63 Wall st.

## PACIFIC MAIL STEAM-SHIP LINE.
TO CALIFORNIA, JAPAN, AND CHINA,
VIA PANAMA.
RATES OF PASSAGE,
(Including all necessaries for the trip:)

New-York to San Francisco—Cabin, $100; steerage, $50, currency.
San Francisco to Yokohama, $250, gold.
San Francisco to Hong Kong, $300, gold.

Steamers leave Pier No. 42 North River, New-York, as follows:
HENRY CHAUNCEY, Capt. W. H. Rathbun, March 1, 12 noon.
COLON, Capt. Z. L. Tanner, March 13, 12 noon.

And every alternate SATURDAY thereafter, connecting with all steamers for Central American and South Pacific ports.

Extra steamers for freight and way passengers will be dispatched on intervening Saturdays as necessity may require.

Steamers leave San Francisco for Japan and China as follows:
ALASKA.....March 1
CITY OF TOKIO.....March 15

For freight or passage or further information apply at the Company's office on wharf foot of Canal st., New-York.

Rufus Hatch, Managing Director. H. J. Bullay, Superintendent.

### WILSON'S LINE OF STEAMERS.
SOUTHAMPTON AND HULL.

These elegant, full-powered steam-ships will be dispatched from Pier No. 45 East River as follows:
Othello, Thursday, Feb. 25. Teddo, Thursday, April 1.
Vega, Thursday, Mar. 18. Colombo, Thurday, April 15.

Parties wishing to visit the Continent and the North will find this the cheapest and the most available route. First cabin, $70 currency; second cabin, $45 currency. Apply at the office of CHARLES L. WRIGHT & Co., Agents, No. 56 South st., three doors west from Wall st.

NEW-YORK, HAVANA AND MEXICAN MAIL S. S. LINE
Steamers leave Pier 3 North River at 3 P. M., as follows
FOR HAVANA DIRECT.
CITY OF MEXICO.....Tuesday Feb. 16
CITY OF VERA CRUZ, (new).....Thursday, Feb. 18
CITY OF NEW-YORK.....Thursday, Feb. 25
FOR VERA CRUZ AND NEW-ORLEANS,
calling at Havana, Progreso, Campeachy, Tuspan, and Tampico.
CITY OF MEXICO.....Tuesday, Feb. 16
CITY OF HAVANA.....Tuesday, March 9

For freight or passage apply to
F. ALEXANDRE & SONS, No. 83 Broadway.

Steamers will leave New-Orleans Feb. 20 and March 13 for Vera Cruz and all the above ports.

## RAILROADS.

### PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD.
THE GREAT TRUNK LINE
AND UNITED STATES MAIL ROUTE.

Trains leave New-York from foot of Desbrosses and Courtlandt sts., as follows:

Express for Harrisburg, Pittsburg, the West and South, with Pullman Palace Cars attached, 9:30 A. M., 5 and 8:30 P. M. Sunday, 5 and 8:30 P. M.

For Williamsport and Lock Haven, (via Philadelphia and Erie Railroad Division, connecting at Philadelphia,) 9:30 A. M. For Williamsport, Lock Haven, Corry, and Erie, 8:30 P. M., connecting at Corry for Titusville, Petroleum Centre, and the Oil Regions.

For Baltimore, Washington, and the South, "Limited Washington Express" of Pullman Parlor Cars daily except Sunday, 2:30 A. M.; arrive Washington 4:40 P. M. Regular at 8:40 A. M.; 3 and 9 P. M. Sunday, 9 P. M.

Express for Philadelphia, 7, 8:40, 9:30 A. M., 12:30, 3, 4, 4:10, 4:50, 5, 7, 8:30, and 9 P. M. Sunday, 4:50, 5, 7, 8:30, and 9 P. M. Emigrant and second class, 7 P. M.

For Newark at 6, 6:30, 7, 7:40, 8, 9, 10, 11 A. M., 12 M., 1, 2, 2:30, 3:10, 3:40, 4:10, 4:30, 5, 5:20, 5:40, 6, 6:10, 6:30, 7, 7:30, 8:10, 10, 11:30 P. M., and 12 night. Sunday, 5:20, 7, and 8:10 P. M.

For Elizabeth, 6, 6:30, 7, 7:40, 8, 9, 10 A. M., 12 M., 1, 2, 2:30, 3:10, 3:40, 4:10, 4:30, 4:50, 5, 5:20, 5:40, 6, 6:10, 6:30, 7, 7:30, 8:10, 10, 11:30 P. M., and 12 night. Sunday, 5:20, 7, and 8:10 P. M.

For Rahway, 6, 6:30, 7, 8, 10 A. M., 12 M., 1, 2, 2:30, 3:10, 3:40, 4:10, 4:30, 4:50, 5:20, 5:40, 6, 6:10, 6:30, 7, 8:10, 10 P. M., and 12 night. Sunday, 5:20 and 7, P. M.

For Woodbridge, Perth Amboy, and South Amboy, 6 and 10 A. M., 2:30, 4:50, and 6 P. M.

For New-Brunswick, 7 and 8 A. M., 12 M., 2, 3:10, 4:10, 5:20, 6:10, 7 P. M., and 12 night. Sunday, 7 P. M.

For East Millstone, 12 noon, 3 and 5:20 P. M.

For Kingston and Rocky Hill, 8:40 A. M. and 4:10 P. M.

For Princeton, 7, 8:40 A. M., 12:30, 2, 4:10 and 7 P. M.

For Lambertville and Flemington, 9:30 A. M. and 2 P. M.

For Philipsburg and Belvidere, 9:30 A. M. and 2 P. M.

For Trenton, Bordentown, Burlington, and Camden, 7 and 9:30 A. M., 12:30, 2, 4, 5, and 7 P. M.

For Freehold, 7 A. M., 2 and 4:10 P. M.

For Farmingdale and Squan, 7 A. M. and 2 P. M.

For Hightstown, Pemberton, and Camden, via Perth Amboy, 2:30 P. M.

For Hightstown and Pemberton, 6 P. M.

Trains arrive as follows: From Pittsburg, 6:35 and 11:20 A. M. and 10:35 P. M., daily; 10:15 A. M. and 7:40 P. M., daily, except Monday. From Washington and Baltimore, 6:20 A. M., 4:15, 5:15, and 10:27 P. M. Sunday, 6:20 A. M. and 10:27 P. M. From Philadelphia, 5:10, 6:20, 6:55, 10:15, 11:20, 11:54 A. M., 2:15, 4:15, 5:15, 7:35, 7:40, 8:44, 10:27 P. M. Sunday 5:10, 6:20, 6:35, 11:54 A. M., 7:40 and 10:27 P. M.

Ticket offices, 526, 944 and 944 Broadway, No. 1 Astor House, and foot of Desbrosses and Courtlandt sts.; No. 4 Court st., Brooklyn; Nos. 114, 116, and 118 Hudson st., Hoboken. Emigrant Ticket Office, No. 8 Battery place.

FRANK THOMSON, General Manager. D. M. BOYD, Jr., General Passenger Agent.

### CENTRAL RAILROAD OF NEW-JERSEY.
ALLENTOWN LINE TO THE WEST.

Passenger and Freight Station in New-York, foot of Liberty st. Connects at Somerville with South Branch Railroad; at Hampton Junction with Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad; at Phillinsburg with Lehigh and Susquehanna Division; also with Lehigh Valley Railroad. Direct lines to Harrisburg, Pittsburg, and the West; also to Central Pennsylvania and New-York State.

WINTER ARRANGEMENT.
Commencing Jan. 18, 1875.—Leave New-York as follows:

5:15 A. M.—News Train for Flemington, Easton, Bethlehem, Bath, Allentown, Manch Chunk, Tamaqua, Townsend, Wilkesbarre, Scranton, &c.

6 A. M.—Way Train for Plainfield.

7 A. M.—Way Train for Easton, Belvidere, Manch Chunk, Wilkesbarre, Pittston, Mahanoy City, Mt. Carmel, Hazleton, Tunkhannock, Towanda, Wyalusing, &c. Connects at Junction with Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad.

9 A. M.—Morning Express, daily, (except Sundays,) for Easton, Allentown, Harrisburg, and the West. Connects at Somerville for Flemington; at Easton for Manch Chunk, Tamaqua, Towanda, Wilkesbarre, Scranton, &c., with through cars to Danville, Williamsport, &c.

10:30 A. M.—Way Train to Somerville.

12:40 P. M.—Express for Flemington, Easton, Bath, Allentown, Manch Chunk, Mahanoy City, Hazleton, Wilkesbarre, Scranton, Reading, Columbia, Lancaster, Ephrata, Pottsville, Harrisburg, &c.

2:30 P. M.—Way Train for Easton, Catasauqua, and Belvidere.

3:30 P. M.—Way Train for Plainfield.

4 P. M.—Way Train for Easton, Allentown, and Manch Chunk. Connects at Junction with Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad.

4:30 P. M.—Way Train for Somerville and Flemington.

5 P. M.—Way Train for Plainfield.

5:15 P. M.—Evening Express, daily, for Easton, Allentown, Manch Chunk, Wilkesbarre, Towanda, Reading, Harrisburg, Pittsburg, Chicago, &c.

6:30 P. M.—Way Train for Somerville.

6 and 6:45 P. M.—Way Trains for Somerville.

7:30 P. M.—(Emigrant.)—For Easton.

9:15 P. M.—Way Train for Somerville.

12 P. M.—For Plainfield.

For Elizabeth at 5:15, 6, 6:15, 6:40, 7, 7:15, 8, 8:45, 9, 9:30, 10:30, 11:15 A. M.; 12 M.; 12:40, 1, 2, 2:30, 3, 3:30, 3:45, 4, 4:15, 4:30, 4:45, 5, 5:15, 5:30, 5:45, 6, 6:15, 6:45, 7:15, 7:30, 8:15, 9:15, 10:30, 11:15, 12 P. M.

R. R. RICKER, Superintendent and Engineer.
H. P. BALDWIN, General Passenger Agent.

### ERIE RAILWAY.
Winter Arrangement of through trains December 1874. From Chambers Street Depot. (For 23d St. see note below.)

9:00 A. M., daily, except Sundays, Cincinnati and Chicago Day Express. Drawing-room coaches to Buffalo and sleeping coaches to Cincinnati and Detroit.

10:45 A. M., daily, except Sundays, Express Mail for Buffalo and Niagara Falls. Sleeping coach to Buffalo.

7:00 P. M., daily, Pacific Express to the West. Sleeping coaches through to Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Cincinnati, Detroit and Chicago without change.

7:00 P. M., except Sundays, Western Emigrant train Above trains leave Twenty-third Street Ferry at 8:45 and 10:15 A. M., and 6:45 P. M.

For local trains, see time-tables and cards in hotels depots.

JNO. N. ABBOTT, General Passenger Agent.

### NEW-YORK CENTRAL AND HUDSON RIVER RAILROAD.
After Nov. 15, 1874, trains will leave Grand Central Depot:

8:00 A. M., Chicago and Northern Express, with drawing-room cars through to Rochester and St. Albans.

10:30 A. M., special Chicago Express, with drawing-room cars to Rochester and Buffalo.

11:00 A. M., Northern and Western Express.

4:00 P. M., Montreal Express, with sleeping cars from New-York to St. Albans.

6:00 P. M., Express, daily, with sleeping cars for Watertown and Canandaigua.

8:00 P. M., Pacific Express, daily, with sleeping cars for Rochester, Buffalo, and Niagara Falls; also for Chicago, via both L. S. and M. C. Railroads.

11:00 P. M., Express, with sleeping cars for Troy and Albany. Way trains as per Local Time Table.

C. H. KENDRICK, General Passenger Agent.

### NEW-YORK, NEW-HAVEN AND HARTFORD RAILROAD.
After Nov. 30, 1874, trains leave Grand Central Depot (42d st.,) for New-Canaan Railroad at 8:05 A. M., 1:00 and 4:38 P. M.; Danbury and Norwalk Railroad at 8:05 A. M., 3:00 and 4:38 P. M.; Naugatuck Railroad at 8:05 A. M. and 3 P. M.; Housatonic Railroad at 8:05 A. M. and 3 P. M.; New-Haven and Northampton Railroad at 8:05 A. M. and 3 P. M.; For Newport at 8:05 A. M. and 1 P. M.; Boston and Albany Railroad at 8:05 and 10 A. M. 3 and 8:10 P. M., (7 P. M. on Sunday;) Boston (via Shore Line) at 1 and 9:10 P. M., (9:10 P. M. on Sundays.) Way trains as per local time tables.

J. T. MOODY, Superintendent New-York Division.
E. M. REED, Vice President New-York.

### WICKFORD RAILROAD ROUTE TO NEWPORT, R. I.
—Passengers for this line take 8:05 A. M. and 1 P. M. express trains from Grand Central Depot, arriving at 4:20 and 8:20 P. M.
THEODORE WARREN, Supt.

## STEAM-BOATS.

### TO FREIGHTERS.
Freight to all points on the New-Haven Railroad received at Pier No. 22 East River, by the Morrisania steam-boats; thence by rail from Harlem River.

### FOR BRIDGEPORT AND ALL POINTS ON
Housatonic and Naugatuck Railroad.—Fare, $1. Steamers leave Catherine-slip at 11:30 A. M.

## FINANCIAL.

# VERMILYE & CO.
## BANKERS,
16 and 18 Nassau st., New-York.

DEALERS IN ALL ISSUES OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.
NEW-YORK CITY
AND BROOKLYN BONDS.
BUY AND SELL ON COMMISSION
RAILWAY STOCKS, BONDS, AND GOLD.

INTEREST ON DEPOSITS.

WASHN R. VERMILYE, JAS. A. TROWBRIDGE
DONALD MACKAY
LATHAM A. FISH

## $2,000,000
## Funded Debt Loan
OF THE
## Eastern Railroad Company of Mass.,

Issued in engraved amounts of $1,000 each, coupon or registered,

Payable in Ten Years from Nov. 1, 1874,

at the Agency of the Company in New-York City, with interest payments each May and November at the rate of

*SEVEN PER CENT.*

Holders of Coupons in New-England may receive payment in Boston by giving notice to the Company five days before maturity.

The SINKING FUND provides

That the amount of one per cent. of this issue for the first year, increasing by one-half of one per cent. each succeeding year, being an average annual amount of

$60,000,

will be redeemable at par prior to maturity, by an annual public drawing in Boston, notice by publication being given of the numbers so designated for payment.

Application will be made to have this issue placed on the Regular List of the New-York Stock Exchange.

This road is now in the highest state of efficiency, with largely-increased earnings over last year.

It is one of the oldest roads in New-England, and has paid to its shareholders over two hundred per cent. since it was finished.

There are no mortgages on this road, and by the laws of the Commonwealth all its issues have the same lien on the entire property, there being no priority whatever.

The statute also expressly provides that in case mortgages are created hereafter, all existing issues shall be equally protected by a First Lien on the entire property, both real and personal, franchise, equipment, &c.

The EASTERN RAILROAD COMPANY, for the funding of its entire floating debt, have authorized Messrs. RICHARDSON, HILL & CO., of BOSTON, to offer the above-described loan for sale to the highest bidders, with the reservation of a minimum price of ninety per cent. and accrued interest, all existing issues shall be equally protected by a First Lien on the entire property, both real and personal, franchise, equipment, &c.

Bids will be received under seal at the office of either of the undersigned, until Monday, the 1st of March, at noon, at which time they will be publicly opened.

Bids to be indorsed "Proposals for Eastern Railroad Loan."

The awards will first be made to the highest bidders, and in case of application exceeding the amount offered, the highest bidders after such first sales will be distributed pro rata to the next highest and equal bids.

Bids will be received, and full information, with forms of proposal, furnished by

RICHARDSON, HILL & CO., Boston.
WINSLOW, LANIER & CO., New-York.
MORTON, BLISS & CO., New-York.

Boston, Feb. 17, 1875.

By authority of the Board of Directors,
JOHN WOOLDREDGE, President.

TO THE STOCKHOLDERS OF THE CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAILROAD COMPANY.—The undersigned have, within a few days, become aware of certain facts connected with the Dubuque roads, which in their judgment make a change in your Board of your Directors expedient, and the following names are recommended for election at the meeting on the 24th inst., at Chicago:

Jas. M. Walker, Chicago. N. Thayer, Boston.
C. S. Colton, Galesburg, Ill. Sidney Bartlett, Boston.
Erastus Corning, Albany. J. H. Clifford, Boston.
John C. Green, New-York. W. J. Rotch, New-Bedford.
J. W. Brooks, Boston. T. J. Coolidge, Boston.

With or without the addition of the undersigned.

Information may be had of Messrs. WARD, CAMPBELL & CO., New-York, one of the undersigned. proxies have already been extensively called for in the interest of the present board, you are now invited, if you approve our suggestion, to attend the meeting or to send proxies in the later case, carefully witnessed, to John N. Griswold. Unmeritorious action or assault. A copy of the usual proxy is, for convenience, annexed, which it will be noted revokes any proxies already given.

(Signed) WARD, CAMPBELL & CO.
(Signed,) JOHN N. GRISWOLD.

*Know all men by these presents:* That ——, the undersigned stockholder in the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, do hereby appoint ——, Attorney and Proxy, for me and in my name, substitution for —— and in —— name to vote at the annual meeting of the stockholders in said company, to be held Feb. —, 18—, or at any adjournment thereof, with all the powers I possess if personally present, hereby revoking all previous proxies.

Witness —— hand and seal.
Dated, [Seal.]

OFFICE OF PENNSYLVANIA COMPANY,
PITTSBURG, PENN., Dec. 5, 1874.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN TO THE HOLDERS of the Third Mortgage Bonds of the Cleveland and Pittsburg Railroad Company maturing May 1, 1875, that the Pennsylvania Company, in charge of the Cleveland and Pittsburg Railroad, under its lease to the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, are prepared to pay, at the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, in the City of New-York, all of the said bonds on and after DEC. 15, 1874, at par and interest to the date of presentation, at any time during business hours.

THOMAS A. SCOTT, President.

CLEVELAND, COLUMBUS, CINCINNATI AND INDIANAPOLIS RAILWAY,
CLEVELAND, Ohio, Feb. 10, 1875.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE STOCKholders of this Company for the election of Directors, and for the transaction of such other business as may come before the meeting, will be held at the office of the Company, in Cleveland, Ohio, WEDNESDAY, March 3, 1875.

The transfer books will be closed at the close of business on Saturday, 20th inst., and reopened on March 4.

GEO. H. RUSSELL, Secretary.

CHICAGO AND ALTON RAILROAD COMPANY,
CHICAGO, Feb. 10, 1875.

NOTICE TO STOCKHOLDERS.—NOTICE IS hereby given to the stockholders of the Chicago and Alton Railroad Company that a Cash Dividend of FIVE per Cent. has been declared upon the Preferred and Common stock of this company, payable at the banking-house of the company's agents, Messrs. M. K. JESUP, PATON & CO., No. 52 William st., New-York, on the 3d day of March next, to holders, who are registered as such at the close of business hours on the 20th day of February, inst., at which time the transfer-books will be closed, and reopened for transfers on the 4th day of March next.

WM. M. LARRABEE, Secretary.

### LEHIGH AND WILKESBARRE COAL COMPANY.
NO. 80 BROADWAY, NEW-YORK, FEB. 10, 1875.

NOTICE.—THE ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKholders and election of a President and Directors of this company for the ensuing year, will be held at their office in the city of PHILADELPHIA, on THURSDAY, 25th inst., at 1 o'clock. The transfer-books will be closed from the 17th to 27th inst., both days inclusive.

WILLIAM H. TILLINGHAST, Secretary.

OFFICE OF PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY,
PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 11, 1875.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE Pennsylvania Railroad Company will pay upon presentation, before March 6, 1875, their scrip issued for the Dividend Dec. 6, 1873, as par, and accrued interest thereon to date of presentation.

On the 6th of March, 1875, this scrip will cease to bear interest, and the company will pay all that may then be outstanding. BAYARD BUTLER, Treasurer.

OFFICE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY,
PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 16, 1875.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE STOCKholders of this company will be held on TUESDAY, March 9, 1875, at 10 o'clock A. M., at Musical Fund Hall, Locust st., above 8th, Philadelphia.

The annual election for Directors will be held on TUESDAY, March 23, 1875, at the company's general office. JOSEPH LESLEY, Secretary.

DEFAULTED RAILROAD BONDS A SPEcialty, and bought by the old-established house of ALBERT H. NICOLAY & CO.,
Stock Brokers and Auctioneers,
No. 43 Pine st., New-York.

N. B.—Choice 7, 8, and 10 per cent. Municipal Bonds and other A1 Investment Securities, paying 10 to 15 per cent., interest promptly paid, for sale below par.

THE ANNUAL ELECTION FOR ELEVEN Directors and three Inspectors of Election of the Harlem Bank will be held at the banking-room, No. 2,291 3d av., on TUESDAY, the 2d day of March, 1875. Polls open from 1 to 3 o'clock P. M.

W. T. RYERSON, Cashier.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERican Coal Company of Allegany County, Maryland, declared this day a semi-annual dividend of Three per Cent., payable on the 10th day of March next. The transfer books will be closed from Feb. 27 until March 11.—New-York, Feb. 8, 1873. M. A. MYERS, Secretary.

LOST.—CERTIFICATE NUMBER SIXTY-TWO, (62,) dated Feb. 5, 1874, for Three Hundred and Thirty-seven (337) SHARES OF STOCK of Empire Laundry, issued to Christian Schwartz, President. The transfer of above certificates has been stopped by the owner.

CHARLES ANGELL, Secretary.

N. Y. MUTUAL GAS.
GREAT WESTERN INS., NATIONAL TRUST, FRANKLIN TELEGRAPH, AND N. Y. GUARANTY & INDEMNITY STOCKS
Bought and sold by W. C. NOYES, Nos. 4 and 6 Pine st.

BROWN BROTHERS & CO.,
NO. 59 WALL ST.,
ISSUE COMMERCIAL and TRAVELERS' CREDITS AVAILABLE in all PARTS of the WORLD.

ATLANTIC, COMMERCIAL, UNION, NEW-York, and Orient Marine Insurance Scrips wanted by WILLIAM C. GILMAN, No. 46 Pine st.

## EXCURSIONS.

STEAM-BOATS AND BARGES FOR EXCURsions to Raritan Beach, Sea View, Iona Island, and other groves. MARTIN & KOSKELL, No. 111 South st.

## BOARDING AND LODGING.

### THE NEW UP-TOWN OFFICE OF THE TIMES.
THE TIMES has established a new Up-town Branch Office for the sale of papers, the reception of advertisements and subscriptions, and the transaction of any business in connection with the paper. It is located at

No. 1,257 Broadway, between 31st and 32d sts.,

and is open daily, Sundays included, from 4 A. M. to 9 P. M.

LARGE, BEAUTIFUL APARTMENTS—Parlor, two chambers, spacious closets, and exquisite bath-room, comprising second floor, furnished with elegance and comfort—will be rented, (with first-class board, if desired,) to one or two responsible gentlemen, or gentleman and wife, willing to pay for superior accommodation in a strictly private family, near 5th av. and 33d st. Address REFERENCE, Box No. 300, TIMES UP-TOWN OFFICE, No. 1,257 BROADWAY.

FURNISHED ROOMS, WITH BOARD.—A few select parties can obtain board with a private family taking a few boarders; good table, new furniture; no moving in May; terms, including grate fire and gas, $16 to $20 per week for two. No. 42 7th st., near 2d av.

NO. 121 EAST 23D ST.—NICELY FURNISHED large room, (southern exposure,) with board; also, rooms suitable for gentleman. House and appointments first class. References.

FIFTH AV., BETWEEN 11TH AND 12TH STS.—Desirable suites of apartments on first and third floors, with private table, on moderate terms, in the pleasantly-located double house No. 45 5th av.

NO. 62 WEST 22D ST.—TO LET, TWO LARGE rooms on second and third story, alcove, hot and cold water; first-class board; also single rooms; references.

FIFTH AV., NO. 351, NEAR 34TH ST.—Front suite of rooms, newly furnished, with piano, &c., with or without board; also a single room; terms moderate.

FIFTH AV., NO. 208, OPPOSITE MADISON PARK.—Handsome suite, four rooms, second floor, to party of adults; house and appointments first-class. Also table board. JOHN P. WORSTELL.

NO. 165 WEST 21ST ST.—WELL-FURNISHED large front room, hall room adjoining, second story front, with good board; also, front room, fourth floor; modern improvements; no moving in May.

NO. 4 EAST 48TH ST.—TO LET, WITH UNexceptionable board, a large front room, on fourth floor; suitable for lady and gentleman or single gentlemen; references exchanged.

NO. 29 WEST 21ST ST.—A LARGE HANDsomely-furnished fourth-story front room, with board. References.

ONE CHARMING SUITE OF APARTMENTS on second floor to rent, together or separately, with or without private table, at No. 29 West 17th st.

NO. 36 EAST 23D ST.—TO LET, WITH BOARD, three rooms on second floor; plenty of closets; private table if desired; no moving in May; references.

NICELY-FURNISHED FRONT ROOM, SUITable for a gentleman and wife, or gentlemen. No. 22 East 41st st.

NEXT DOOR TO GRAND HOTEL.—Vacated 1st of March, an elegantly furnished floor; highest references exchanged. No. 36 West 31st st.

MRS. WILLIAMS, NO. 266 4TH AV., IS OFfering a very desirable first floor suite, with private table.

NO. 17 WEST 37TH ST.—HALL ROOM TO let, with board; best references given and required.

## BOARD WANTED.

BOARD WANTED—IN A PRIVATE FAMILY FOR gentleman, wife, infant and nurse; large and small room; will furnish everything except carpet, fire, and gas. Address, st

# LOCAL MISCELLANY.

## THE METROPOLITAN GAS-LIGHT COMPANY.

### DISCRIMINATING PRICES AMONG CONSUMERS DECLARED TO BE UNLAWFUL.

In Superior Court, Trial Term, Part I., before Judge Speir and a jury, a case of much importance to consumers of gas in this City was tried and decided yesterday. The Metropolitan Gas-light Company brought suit against J. Pierpont Morgan to recover over $300 for gas furnished to defendant at his house and stables in Forty-first street. The suit was defended on the ground that by reason of the competition of the Mutual Gas-light Company, consumers residing in the districts where the latter company had its pipes laid, were charged only at the rate of $2 25 per thousand cubic feet by the Metropolitan Gas-light Company, while its consumers outside of such districts were charged at the rate $2 75 per one thousand cubic feet. This increased rate the defendant claimed he could not be forced to pay, the company having no right to discriminate between its customers in the price of gas. On the part of the company it was claimed by Messrs. Beardsley and Cole, its counsel, that it had a right to make two prices, or three prices if it deemed proper, there being no law or provisions in its charter prohibiting it.

Judge Speir said the question presented in the case on this point was both new and important. He was of opinion that a public corporation such as the plaintiff in this suit, having large and valuable privileges under its charter, should administer its affairs on the broadest principles of equity and good conscience; that acting on those principles it had no right to take advantage of competition in its own behalf without affording the public to take equal advantage of it, that it had no right to charge one customer a less rate where this competition prevailed than was charged to another customer where it did not prevail; that in this case the difference in charges must be regarded as unauthorized; certainly so, unless previous direct notice of such difference was brought home to the party from whom the higher price was demanded, so that he, if he could or chose to do so, could avail himself of the benefits of the competition.

Messrs. Tracy, Olmsted & Tracy, who appeared for defendant, said, under this view of the court, they had no objection to have a judgment entered against their client at the lesser rate—$2 25 per 1,000 cubic feet of gas—and Judge Speir thereupon directed a verdict to be entered at that rate in favor of plaintiff, the whole amount, with interest, being $294 30. The court further directed that, as the question was an important one, execution on the judgment be stayed, and the appeal proposed to be taken by the gas company be heard at General Term in the first instance.

Mr. Cole, on behalf of the gas company, stated to the court that, since the question in this case was first raised by defendant, the company had raised its prices to all consumers to $2 75.

## THE ALDERMEN HEARING CHARGES AGAINST THE CONTROLLER.

### THE MANAGEMENT OF THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT—MR. WALES' STATEMENT OF MR. GREEN'S RELATIONS TO THE DOCK COMMISSION.

The Law Committee of the Board of Aldermen, consisting of Messrs. Purroy, Shandley, and Billings, met yesterday in pursuance of the resolutions authorizing them to investigate the management of the Finance Department. Mr. Purroy, in presiding, said that only two of the witnesses summoned, Commissioner Salem H. Wales and Mr. John B. Haskin, were present. The others, namely, Commissioners Howe, Wheeler, and Van Nort, Deputy Commissioner Barker, and Justice Fowler, were absent. Mr. Howe, who is one of the Commissioners of Accounts, was subpœnaed to give testimony relative to the manner of transacting business in the Controller's office, but the latter was not notified to appear. After a brief discussion in relation to the absence of witnesses, Mr. Purroy and his colleague, Mr. Shandley, said they were in favor of enforcing the attendance of all who had been summoned by procuring an order from the court compelling them to appear. Messengers were sent to bring in the absentees, but they failed to find them at their respective offices. The Chairman having explained the object of the meeting, Mr. John B. Haskin said he had prepared certain charges and specifications against Controller Green, whom he regarded as an obstructionist who was checking the growth of the City, and he believed the facts he would present would warrant his removal. He closed by stating that he would have the charges ready for presentation at the next meeting of the committee, and that he thought it would be necessary for them to employ a stenographer, and make each witness subscribe to his sworn statement. Mr. Purroy said that the committee were willing to engage the services of a stenographer, but they did not know that any appropriation would be made to pay him.

**Mr. Wales was then sworn, and made a statement relative to the trouble between the Dock Department and the Controller. He said that the Dock Commissioners in the Summer of 1873 advertised for proposals to furnish granite for the construction of Pier No. 1 North River. A contract was awarded on October 8, in the same year, and the sureties were sent to the Controller for his approval, but Mr. Green disapproved of them. On March 3, 1874, a new contract was awarded, and the sureties were accepted on the 24th of the same month. The course of the Controller in delaying action on these sureties had hindered the work for about six months, thus incurring a loss of half the rent for which the pier could be leased, or about $30,000. The Dock Department opened bids on Jan. 11, 1875, for the construction of four scows to finish the work on the bulkhead of a portion of the North River. The usual formalities were complied with. Mr. Green, however, objected to the lowest bid on the ground that a word had been omitted in the affidavits attached to the contract. After consultation, the Commissioners decided to refer the matter to the Corporation Counsel, who gave an opinion that it was not valid. The contract was given to the next lowest bidder, and a list of his sureties was forwarded to the Controller on Jan. 21, 1874, but they had not been approved up to the present time. He desired also to refer to another matter. About Feb. 1 the Dock Commissioners invited proposals to construct two sheds to cover shifting piers. But the lowest bid was found to be defective or informal from the absence of a word in the affidavit. Mr. Green's attention was called to the matter, and he immediately answered in his peculiar way that he was not the legal adviser of the Department of Docks. He was then informed that he first made objection to awarding a contract from which the word was omitted. Finally the contract was given to a competitor whose bid was $6,541 higher than that of the lowest one. It should be remembered that while these improvements would add to the City debt, the work of the Dock Department was bringing in a good revenue, and any delay in its prosecution would result in loss to the City. All the improvements were made with a view to accommodate commerce and produce returns. Before improvements were made on the Pacific Mail piers the rent paid was $25,000 a year; it was now $45,000. The cost of the improvements was only $8,000. The Hoboken Land and Improvement Company paid before their docks were improved only $900; their rent now was $15,000. The North Shore Company paid $10,000 a year for property which, unimproved, was rented to the National Government for $1,500. He and his colleagues were unanimous in their opinion that the Controller, in delaying or obstructing the works of their department, was damaging the interests of the Metropolis. When he (Mr. Wales) first assumed office as a Dock Commissioner, he found that the Controller had not sent to the board a report of the weekly balances to its credit, as required by the charter. In order to obtain the desired information, he sent two letters to the Controller requesting him to furnish reports of the balances; but he paid no attention to them. On the occasion when the heads of the departments were holding a conference with the Mayor he called the latter's attention to the matter, and for the first time a list of the balances was sent to his department on Saturday last. It was accompanied by a note stating that the list was forwarded, not as a matter of right, but of courtesy. Mr. Wales then said that when Mr. Green was asked for information in relation to the sureties on the contracts for the building of two sheds for shifting piers, he said that he was awaiting the opinion of the Corporation Counsel as to the validity of the contract; but, as the Corporation Counsel had already given an opinion on like contracts, there was no necessity for a new one, as all the issues relative to awarding the contracts had been apparently disposed of in a previous decision. Mr. Wales then referred to the recent trouble between Mr. Green and his board in connection with the opening of bids before the Controller had arrived, and also to the resolutions censuring the Controller for the course he pursued on the occasion.**

Mr. Purroy requested Commissioner Wales to furnish the committee with copies of the correspondence between his department and Mr. Green.

**Mr. Haskin said he would be ready to present his charges on Tuesday next, and the committee adjourned until that day.**

## ALLEGED PAYMENT OF A SUBSCRIPTION UNDER FALSE REPRESENTATIONS.

Mrs. Lawrence H. Jerome sued to recover $3,000, alleged to have been paid to Messrs. Cisco & Clark under implied misrepresentations, the facts, as claimed by her, being as follows: In 1853 the Clifton Iron Company being somewhat embarrassed pecuniarily, a project was set on foot to raise $200,000 by subscription, to meet its immediate liabilities. This subscription was to be secured by an assignment to Trustees of the proceeds arising from the sale of the ores of the company's mine for three years, together with second mortgage bonds to be issued on the company's account. John J. Cisco and L. C. Clark, the defendants, at whose office the bonds were made payable, were appointed Trustees, and to them was to be paid the subscriptions, the condition of the latter being that they were not to be binding on any one subscriber until the whole $200,000 was subscribed. Mr. Lawrence H. Jerome subscribed $5,000 on behalf of his wife, the plaintiff. In May, 1869, Mr. Jerome received a letter, purporting to come from the Trustees, asking for a check for $5,000 subscribed in the name of his wife, and the amount was sent to them. Soon thereafter the company was broken up, leaving no assets. Mrs. Jerome then brought the present suit to recover her $5,000, claiming that, though only $145,000 of the $200,000 had then been subscribed according to the original conditions, the letter of Messrs. Cisco and Clark was an implied representation that the whole amount had been subscribed, and that this misrepresentation absolved her from her subscription. Defendants deny both the sending of the letter and the receipt of the money. The case is now on trial before Judge Van Brunt and a jury.

## THE LINEN THREAD CASE.

### SEIZED BOOKS RULED OUT—DECISION OF JUDGE BLATCHFORD.

The case in which the Government seeks to recover penalties from Hughes & Co. for alleged undervaluation of invoices, &c., was resumed yesterday in the United States District Court before Judge Blatchford. Assistant District Attorney Simons offered the seized books of the defendants in evidence. Mr. Sherburne B. Eaton, counsel for the defendants, objected, under the act of February, 1868.

Judge Blatchford said that this was the first time, to his knowledge, that this question had been raised. He was quite satisfied that seized books could not be used in evidence on a forfeiture suit against the party from whom the books were taken, but they could be used against all other parties. The arbitrary seizures of books and papers, authorized by the acts of 1863 and 1867, had produced irritation, and it was fair to presume that the result of this dissatisfaction at arbitrary seizures had found expression in the act of 1868. It was a fundamental principle of early English law, and permeating our own laws, that no man should be made to convict himself, either in a criminal action or in one for the recovery of a penalty or a forfeiture. The proper way to endeavor to get books and papers before the court in cases under the revenue laws was for the Government to move for such production, pointing out with precision what books or papers were wanted, and setting out what allegations were to be proved by them. Upon hearing this motion, after notice given to the defense, the court might, in its discretion, order the production of the specified books or papers, and upon failure to produce them, without satisfactory explanation, the matter offered to be proved by them would be taken as confessed. Whether the books in the present case, which were already in the custody of the court, could be used in evidence against Hughes & Co. was a question which could be disposed of on such a motion.

The court adjourned to 11 A. M. to-day, when Assistant District Attorney Simons is to make the motion indicated by Judge Blatchford.

## THE JEWELRY SWINDLE.

### SENTENCE OF GEORGE WYMAN TO FIVE YEARS IN STATE PRISON—A STAY OF EXECUTION DENIED.

George Wyman, convicted a few days since in the Court of Oyer and Terminer of the larceny of bracelets and other jewelry, which he had borrowed for exhibition, was yesterday sentenced by Judge Barrett to five years' imprisonment in State Prison. In passing sentence Judge Barrett spoke as follows:

"You have been convicted of one the most heinous crimes which can be committed against a commercial community. It is a crime which strikes at the very root of confidence and credit. It is you, and such as you, Wyman, who help to bring about a general feeling of insecurity in the community; to paralyze activities and industries, and to cause stagnation in trade. The court trusts that your conviction and sentence will be a lesson to those swindling traders who, by artfully secreting their property for their own uses, so as to prevent it getting into the hands of their creditors, and by means of false representations and fraudulent bankruptcies are daily and hourly preying upon the honorable merchants of our City. With those unfortunate people who commit petit larceny because of want and dire necessity the court has heartfelt sympathy, but with you, and such as you, there can be no such sympathy. You deserve, and shall have, the full penalty of the law; and the judgment of the court is that you be imprisoned in the State Prison at hard labor for the period of five years."

An application of Mr. William F. Kintzing, the prisoner's counsel, for a stay of execution of sentence until a bill of exceptions could be prepared and a motion made for a writ of error, was denied by the court.

## A DISAPPOINTED EMBEZZLER.

### AN OFFICER OF THE ROYAL BANK OF DUBLIN APPROPRIATES MONEY AND ELOPES —HE IS ARRESTED HERE AND DEPRIVED OF HIS MONEY.

S. J. Eland, an Assistant Secretary in the Royal Bank of Dublin, Ireland, embezzled £400 of the funds of the bank, and eloped with a young woman for whom he had formed an attachment, taking passage with her on the steamer City of Chester for this port, and leaving a wife and three children in Dublin. The bank telegraphed to Man & Parsons, lawyers in this city, to take legal proceedings to obtain the stolen property. The firm instituted a suit in the Supreme Court, and Judge Lawrence granted an order of arrest against Eland, fixing the bail at $3,000. Deputy Sheriff Jeffries boarded the City of Chester at dawn yesterday morning off Quarantine, and proceeded at once to Eland's state-room, and inquired for "Mr. S. J. Franks," an alias used by Eland, who immediately responded. The Deputy told Eland his errand, and informed him that if he surrendered the stolen money he would not be punished. Eland hesitated, and the Deputy threatened a search, when Eland's female companion immediately urged Eland to give up the money, saying, "For Heaven's sake, give it to him." Eland then gave the Deputy drafts for £395, saying that that was all he had. Eland was brought ashore, the drafts were cashed, and he was discharged from custody by Order of Arrest Sheriff Quincey, with the consent of the counsel for the bank. Eland is a fine-looking man of about twenty-five years of age, and seemed greatly depressed at the failure of his effort.

## DISCIPLINE IN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Commissioner Disbecker presided at the Police trials yesterday and heard evidence in over sixty complaints against members of the department. The most important case on the calendar was that against Capt. Thomas Killalea, of the Eleventh Precinct, who stands charged with having received during the year from Frank and Phillip Koch, the proprietors of the Central Park Garden, and from Fritz Kassafauge, proprietor of the National Hall and Garden, $100 per month each for Police services rendered at their respective establishments without permission from the Board of Police and in violation of the rules of the department. Capt. Killalea appeared yesterday accompanied by his counsel, and asserted his entire innocence of the serious charges preferred against him; he was ready to proceed to trial. Commissioner Disbecker, however, adjourned the case until next Thursday at 1 P. M., when it will be heard before the full board. Sergt. Lemuel S. Slater, of the Seventh Precinct, was charged by Roundsman Brophy, of the same precinct, with standing at an oyster stand eating while on patrol duty. The Roundsman explained that his reason for making the charge was that the Sergeant had reproved him the night previous for drinking a cup of coffee while on patrol, and he deemed it his duty to decide whether the Sergeant had any better right to violate the rules than a Roundsman. The Sergeant admitted the charge, and the case was referred to the board. Sergt. Slater next appeared as complainant against Roundsman Hugh Watts, of the Seventh Precinct, whom he charged with having been in the office of Alanson Briggs, in Water street, for sixty-five minutes on the morning of the 11th inst. The Roundsman denied the charge, and showed by several witnesses that he could not have been in the office at the time named. The Roundsman attributed the complaint to the fact that Sergt. Slater had heard that he [the Roundsman] was about to prefer a charge against him for being asleep in the station-house for two hours, when he should have been on patrol. The evidence in this case showed that affairs in the Seventh Precinct are in a very demoralized condition, and Commissioner Disbecker said that he would have the matter thoroughly investigated. Both complaints were referred to the board. Sergts. Gallagher, of the First Precinct; Joseph E. Kelly, of the Fourth Precinct, and E. P. Whitcomb, of the Nineteenth Precinct, were arraigned for neglect of duty, and, the charges being proved, the complaints were referred to the board.

## THE CHARITY COMMISSION.

The Commissioners of Charities and Correction yesterday adopted a resolution ordering the compilation of a correct census of the inmates of the City Asylum for the Insane, and directing the Warden to report to the board if there are patients in the institution chargeable to any county or State other than New-York County, or any inmates who can afford to pay for board and treatment in any private asylum. The board yesterday advertised for proposals for 2,000 tons of coal, to be distributed among the various institutions. The contract for furnishing the department with 100,000 pounds of sugar was awarded to Robert Seaman & Co. at the following rates: 25,000 pounds at 7½ cents; 25,000 pounds at 7⅞ cents; 25,000 pounds at 7⅞ cents, and 25,000 pounds at 8 cents.

## LEWD HOUSES DISTURBED.

On Tuesday night Officers Dyer and Sullivan, of the Tenth Precinct, made a raid on the disorderly house No. 137 Canal street, and arrested the proprietress, Josephine Rogers, with three young girls, inmates of the place. They were all arraigned before Justice Bixby, at Essex Market Police Court, yesterday, and the woman Rogers held in $1,000 bail for trial. The girls were each fined $10 and required to give bail in $500 for their future good behavior. The same officers arrested ten girls throughout the Tenth Ward for disorderly conduct, and all of them were sent to the Island for ten days.

## A DRUNKEN FIGHT ON SHIPBOARD.

### A PROBABLY FATAL WOUND GIVEN—ARREST OF THE PARTICIPANTS.

A sailor from the ship Edith Warren, at present lying at Martin's stores, Brooklyn, called an officer of the Second Precinct, yesterday morning, and told him that a man was lying in the ship very sick. The officer went on board, and, descending to the cabin, found two men occupying bunks in the apartment. One of them was apparently suffering great pain, and had his clothes covered with blood. The other was evidently in a drunken sleep. The officer procured assistance, and had the wounded man removed to the York Street Police Station. The other occupant of the cabin, John Lawrence by name, and Thomas Gallagher, the sailor who called the officer, was placed under arrest. The name of the wounded man is John Williams. He was questioned as to how he came by his wounds, but was so weak that he could give no detailed story. Pointing to Lawrence, he said, "That is the man who stabbed me." Gallagher, whose hand is badly cut, gives the following account of the affair: About 11 o'clock on Tuesday night Lawrence came on board drunk. He wanted to fight me, and drawing a knife cut me on the hand. Williams, seeing Lawrence draw the knife, ran to my aid. Lawrence at once turned upon Williams and plunged the knife into his right side, just below the arm pit. Gallagher admitted that he also was drunk, and had but an indistinct recollection of the occurrence. Lawrence, when asked why he stabbed Williams, said he had no recollection of stabbing him. Williams is dangerously wounded, and the doctors at the City Hospital, where he at present, lie pronounce his recovery doubtful. Lawrence and Gallagher were taken before Justice Walsh yesterday. The former was held to await the result of Williams' injuries, and the latter as a witness.

## THE EAST RIVER BRIDGE.

The first meeting of the new Board of Bridge Directors was held yesterday in Brooklyn. There were present Mayor Hunter, Controller Powell, Henry C. Murphy, David M. Stone, Thomas Carroll, William C. Kingsley, J. S. T. Stranahan, William Marshall, George L. Nichols, Samuel Booth, of Brooklyn; and Mayor Wickham, James M. McLean, James M. Motley, John Reilly, Lloyd Aspinwall, Charles J. Canda, and F. B. Thurber, of New-York. The only members of the board absent were Lawrence J. Turnure, A. S. Hewitt, and Controller Green, of New-York.

Mr. Stranahan called the meeting to order, and nominated Mayor Wickham to the chair. Mr. Henry C. Murphy, then addressed the meeting, giving a brief outline of the cost and progress of the work, in which he stated that the whole cost of the bridge when completed would be $13,000,000.

Mr. Stranahan then moved that a committee of two members from each city be appointed by the Chair, to nominate officers for the proper organization of the board. Mayor Hunter, Mr. Stranahan, of Brooklyn, and Messrs. McLean and Aspinwall, of New-York, were appointed, and withdrew for consultation. The board then took a recess, and during that time Mr. Murphy read portions of a bill he had prepared, the object of which was to divest the control and corporate nature of the work, to make it a public institution, and providing that the present Board of Directors should be appointed Trustees. The committee on nominating officers returned and reported the members had not sufficient time for consultation, and after some unimportant action the meeting was adjourned until Tuesday next, at 2 o'clock P. M.

## DISMISSALS FROM THE CUSTOMS SERVICE.

The official sources of information located in the Custom-house say that there have been no further removals. A plan of a general reduction of salaries has been adopted, but no schedule has yet been made out, and no details will be made public before March 1, if then. Among the unfortunates who have been removed are the following: Day Inspectors Sidney Smith, Edward Ware, D. Cook, Andrew Gillespie, Sullivan, and Young; Special Service Inspectors Hussey, Barclay, and Ryan; Night Inspectors Thomas Hill, Hugh Colman, Daniel Mix, Duffy, and Brophy; C. B. White and Smythe, clerks in the Fourth Division; Armstrong, a clerk in the Liquidating Department; Brown, bond clerk in the Ninth Division, and Kennedy, a clerk in the same division, who has been South for his health for over a year.

The Collector says that these men were not removed for any cause, but simply because orders from Washington compelled him to reduce his force. Those officials who remain say that next month, when the vessels begin to come in in large numbers, there will not be employes enough to attend to them all.

## A BOOK-KEEPER PLAYS FARO AT HIS EMPLOYERS' EXPENSE.

In the Court of General Sessions yesterday Leo Witkowsky, book-keeper in the employ of Brown & Libman, No. 8 Walker street, was called up for trial by District Attorney Nolan, charged with stealing $57 on Jan. 14. Brown & Libman both testified that they saw the book-keeper take money out of the cash drawer and rush out of the office. Detective Dyer, who arrested Witkowsky, testified that the prisoner had admitted to him that he had stolen the money and spent it in a faro bank at Fourth avenue and Nineteenth street; that he was desperate and had made several attempts to commit suicide, and was unfit to live. Witkowsky, who is a smart thief, took the stand in his own defense and denied that he stole any money from his employer. He then described several efforts he had made to commit suicide. The amount of the money stolen not having been proved to the satisfaction of the jury, Witkowsky was only found guilty of petit larceny and sent to the Penitentiary for six months.

## THE ADAMS EXPRESS ROBBERY.

In the Court of Oyer and Terminer yesterday, before Judge Barrett, ex-Judge Richard Busteed made application for an order directing that the relations and counsel of John Sweeny have access to him at all reasonable hours. Sweeny is held in the House of Detention as a witness against Hanrey, who is charged with participating in the Adams Express robbery. It was claimed that Sweeny's sister had been refused access to him except in the presence of an official of the prison, and letters sent him were not delivered unless with permission from the office of the District Attorney. Assistant District Attorney Russell said he knew of no objection to counsel visiting the prisoner, but stated he had exercised a proper discretion in refusing free admission to the sister of Sweeny, as it had been discovered, by a letter which she addressed to him, that she was conveying threats, uttered by Haur ey, intended to intimidate Sweeny from becoming a witness against him. Judge Barrett said he did not think it was a matter in which he could properly interfere, but took the application under consideration.

## THE ELEVATED RAILROAD.

A suit will be instituted in the Supreme Court, before Judge Lawrence to-day, against the New-York Elevated Railroad Company by Joseph Haight, Jr., Charles Galloway, Stephen H. Davenport, and William J. Davenport, property-owners on the westerly side of Greenwich street, in the Ninth Ward, to restrain the defendants from constructing a road and turnouts on that side of Greenwich street. The plaintiffs allege that in order to construct the road the company will be obliged to take up the pavement and sidewalk on that side of the street, and that the road would be a nuisance to property-owners in that district. They further allege that the right of the company to construct the road has long since ceased; also, that the road has never paid the tax of five per cent. of its net earnings into the City Treasury, to prove which they show by the report of the company that the net earnings last year were $82,945, while the sum paid to the Controller only amounted to $45 74.

## THE BRYANT TESTIMONIAL.

The committee charged with selecting the vase for the Bryant testimonial have chosen the design prepared by Mr. J. H. Whitehouse, of the house of Tiffany & Co. The vase is of solid oxidized silver, twenty-five inches high. Mr. Bryant's head is on one side of the vase, and medallions with bas-reliefs, illustrating various points in his life and works, are placed at regular intervals around the bowl. Four scenes are represented. In the first his father is instructing him in versification; the second shows the poet in the woods; the third represents him as a journalist, and the fourth as a translator of the Iliad and Odyssey. The lower part of the bowl is ornamented with the two great products of America, cotton and maize.

## ARRIVALS AT THE HOTELS.

Gen. Fitz John Porter is at the Clarendon Hotel.

E. B. Judson, of Syracuse, is at the Windsor Hotel.

Henry Adams and Nathaniel Hooper, of Boston, are at the Brevoort House.

William H. Seward and E. P. Ross, of Auburn, are at the St. Nicholas Hotel.

John McCullough, the tragedian, is at the Sturtevant House.

Col. R. S. Mackenzie, United States Army, and Gen. H. W. Birge, of Connecticut, are at the Hoffman House.

Judge Ransom Balcom, of Binghamton, and Congressman-elect Charles H. Joyce, of Vermont, are at the Grand Central Hotel.

George B. McCartee, of the Treasury Department, Ward Cheney, and C. S. Bushnell, of Connecticut, and Charles P. Kimball, of Maine, are at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.

# CITY AND SUBURBAN NEWS.

## NEW-YORK.

Hot-house strawberries are now on the market at $12 a quart.

Mlle. Albani sailed for Europe yesterday on board the steam-ship Abyssinia.

The Abyssinia took out 53,800 letters and eighty-four bags of newspapers yesterday.

Isaac Newton was found guilty yesterday of grand larceny, and sentenced by Recorder Hackett to three years in State Prison.

The motion for an injunction to prevent the use of snow-plows by the City railroads is to be argued before Judge Robinson at 10 o'clock to-day.

Freight for all Eastern points is now received by the Morrisania steam-boats, Pier No. 22 East River, and forwarded from Harlem River by rail.

The Israelite General Benevolent Society gave its ninth annual ball at the Turn Hall last night in aid of a fund for destitute and poor Hebrew families.

Andrew Gilligan, alias Charles Harrison, was held for examination yesterday by Justice Otterbourg, at Jefferson Market Police Court, on suspicion of burglary.

At 9 o'clock last night Frederick Frieze, of No. 251 West Forty-first street, fell on the sidewalk near his residence, and expired shortly after. Cause of death unknown.

Miss Jeanie Jewell Hotchkiss gave her first dramatic recital in this City at Steinway Hall last evening. She was warmly welcomed by a large and fashionable audience.

Vice President Wilson left this City yesterday for Washington, after taking leave of ex-Gov. Claflin and wife, of Massachusetts, who sailed for Europe in the steam-ship Abyssinia.

Thomas Rogers, aged twenty-three, residing at No. 601 Greenwich street, dropped dead at 6:30 o'clock last evening, in the rear yard of No. 597 Greenwich street. It is not known what caused his death.

Michael Gorman, a longshoreman, charged with stabbing Peter Crogban, of No. 14 Roosevelt street, was acquitted by the jury in the Court of General Sessions yesterday, under instructions from Recorder Hackett.

A lecture on "Pharmacy, its History and Origin in the United States, and the Pharmaceutical Weights and Measures," was last evening delivered by Prof. Bedford, at the Women's Medical College, No. 51 St. Mark's place.

The British steam-ship Alexandria arrived yesterday from Trieste, after a passage of fifty-three days. She encountered heavy gales and much ice on her voyage, and was compelled to put into Cape Canso, Nova Scotia, and Halifax, for coal.

Last night, at 8 o'clock, Hattie Throckmorton, of No. 42 Jackson street, Williamsburg, was assaulted by Charles Burman, on the corner of South Fifth avenue and Houston street. Her injuries are very serious, and Burman has been arrested.

Last evening Mr. John Paton delivered a lecture entitled "The Elements of Success," in the Working Men's Free Reading-room, No. 207 Greenwich street. The next lecture in the course will be given by Dr. E. D. G. Prime, of this City, on the 25th instant.

Michael Keating was caught on Tuesday night walking off with a quantity of lead pipe from the house of Andrew Klarman, No. 606 East Fourteenth street. Justice Bixby, at Essex Market Police Court yesterday, held him for trial in default of $1,000 bail.

James Corrigan and Matilda Lyons reside at No. 705 East Twelfth street. They had an altercation which resulted in dangerous broomstick practice by James on Matilda's head. Her injuries were attended to at Bellevue Hospital, and Corrigan was locked up.

In the few pools sold at Daly's billiard saloon, on the four-handed billiard match, between Cyrille and Joseph Dion on one side and Garnier and Daly on the other, Garnier and Daly had the call at twenty-five to twenty. The match will take place this evening.

Dion Boucicault has given the bond in $5,000 required of him by Judge Woodruff to insure "Josh" Hart from loss on account of the injunction against him, in the event of its not being made permanent. Messrs. Hugh J. Hastings and Theodore Moss are the sureties on the bond.

Richard Fleming, alias Richard Flannigan, was held in default of $2,000 bail yesterday by Justice Bixby, at Essex Market Police Court, charged with burglary. He was arrested in the house of Marcus Cohen, No. 76 St. Mark's place, having broken in through the basement.

The German citizens and reform organizations of the Sixth, Twelfth, Sixteenth, and Twentieth Assembly Districts, met at their respective headquarters last night, and elected delegates to a central organization, which is to meet for organization in the course of a few weeks.

The funeral of ex-Councilman Thomas Brady took place yesterday morning from St. Mary's Church, corner of Grand and Ridge streets. A solemn requiem mass for the repose of his soul was celebrated, and the remains were then taken for interment to Calvary Cemetery.

Henry Beach, a canvasser, residing at the Grant House, on New Bowery, was found insensible in his room yesterday about 1 o'clock. He was taken to the Park Hospital. It is supposed that he took laudanum. His habits appear to be somewhat peculiar, and he was noticed as shaking constantly.

The committee of the Chamber of Commerce, which was sent to Albany to urge the closing of the lateral canals, secured a hearing from the Senate Committee only. The Assembly Committee appointed to-day for a hearing, but the committee will not go up, owing to the illness of several of its members.

Joseph A. Vose, advertising agent, of No. 314 West Fifty-fifth street, foreman of the jury in the case of Martin Campbell, manager of the Metropolitan Theatre, indicted for the can-can nuisance, who obstinately stood out for acquittal against the verdict of guilty of the other eleven jurors, was yesterday excused from further service in the General Sessions Court.

John P. O'Brien, the keeper of a liquor store at No. 342 Seventh avenue, was yesterday arraigned before Justice Flammer, at the Yorkville Police Court, on charge of receiving stolen goods. In O'Brien's possession were found thirteen boxes of cigars, part of the proceeds of a burglary committed recently upon the liquor store kept by Herman A. Suhr at No. 678 Eighth avenue, by James Rodgers and James Brown.

On Tuesday night Officer Larkin, of the Seventh Precinct, arrested Robert Bellstab, in Canal street, having in his possession about $40 worth of lead-pipe, for which he could not account satisfactorily. Shortly after it was discovered that the pipe had been stolen from the house of Samuel Caspar, No. 328 East Broadway. At Essex Market Police Court yesterday Justice Bixby held Bellstab in default of $1,000 bail for trial.

The Executive Committee of the Local Board of Fire Underwriters held a fourth meeting yesterday morning, to consider the plan devised by a subcommittee for the adjustment of the grievances complained of by members of the board, to the effect that other members had secretly undercut the established rates. After a long discussion they asked for an extension of time. They were given until Friday, when they promised to make a report.

For several days past the officials of the Pacific Mail Steam-ship Company have been going around among the tea merchants, importuning them to sign a petition to Congress praying for the passage of the extra subsidy. Yesterday the petition was sent to Washington, where Rufus Hatch and a large delegation of the company's Directors are manipulating the lobby in favor of the measure.

On the 2d of January last the clothing store of Peter Thumas, No. 215 Third street, was broken into and wearing apparel valued at $130 was stolen. A silver cornet valued at $60 was also carried away by the thieves. The latter was found in the possession of Jacob Faucher and Julius Ackermann, of No. 38 Second street, and yesterday, at Essex Market Police Court, Justice Bixby held the prisoners in default of $2,000 bail each.

Bernard Woods, the man charged with beating Michael Fanniug, a fellow-fireman on the steamer Henry Chauncey, so as to cause his death, was brought before Commissioner Shields, yesterday, and held for an examination at 2 o'clock next Saturday afternoon. Woods strongly asserted that Fanning's injuries were caused by an accidental fall, from which he soon recovered, and that his death resulted from a severe attack of Chagres fever.

A meeting of the German residents of the Tenth Ward was held last evening at Nos. 77 and 79 Essex street, for the purpose of providing relief for the poor. Contributions of money and food have already been received, and it was resolved to open the house No. 104 Allen street this afternoon and dispense charity to those requiring it. The services of a medical practitioner will also be furnished on application at the house in Allen street.

The house and lot situated on the corner of Lexington avenue and Thirtieth street, owned and occupied by the Andrew Jackson Club, were sold yesterday at auction by H. B. Hertz & Sons, auctioneers, at the Exchange Sales-rooms, under a foreclosure in the Supreme Court of a mortgage for $5,000, held by Mr. George P. Wetmore. Mr. Thomas J. McCahill was the purchaser in the sum of $2,300. The furniture will be sold at auction in the course of a few weeks.

A committee of the Washington Heights Association yesterday waited on the Park Commissioners, and argued for the completion of the work of improving the district north of One Hundred and Fifty-fifth street, the construction of a suspension bridge at One Hundred and Eighty-first street, and the establishment of roads from Tenth avenue to the Harlem River, between One Hundred and Fifty-second and One Hundred and Eighty-first streets. The committee also recommend the completion of Riverside Park.

Four young men, named Thomas McGuire, William Broderick, Thomas Rourke, and Peter Woods, alias George Woodruff, were yesterday arrested by the Police of the Nineteenth Precinct, and taken before Justice Flammer, at the Yorkville Police Court, on suspicion of being sneak thieves. The first two were identified by Mrs. Roach, of No. 880 Third avenue, as two burglars whom she had surprised in her room on returning there the previous afternoon, and they were committed for trial for burglary.

On Tuesday night Detectives Field and O'Connor, of the District Attorney's Office, discovered the whereabouts of James O'Brien and Edward Broderick, whom they arrested on a charge of highway robbery. The accused were indicted with two others for assaulting Patrick Slavin, of Second avenue and One Hundred and Fourteenth street, on Sept. 17, 1873, robbing him of $25. They were admitted to bail, which they forfeited. Yesterday morning they were committed to the Tombs without bail.

## BROOKLYN.

There is a balance in the City Treasury of $1,186,374 51, deposited in twelve city banks.

Superintendent Folk is recovering from his recent severe illness, and will resume his duties at Police Head-quarters next week.

Mr. Frederick Massey, President of the Fire Department, expresses the opinion that half the fire hydrants in this city are frozen.

A German named Puliock, who was much addicted to drink, was found dead in his bed yesterday morning at his residence, corner of North Seventh and Sixth streets.

To-day will be observed as a day of prayer by the Temperance Union of Christian Women. Meetings will be held each hour at Association Hall from 11 A. M. to 5 P. M.

Edward Maxwell and William Picket were committed for examination by Justice Walsh yesterday on a charge of dealing policy at No. 31 Charles street. All the paraphernalia of a policy shop were captured at the above number when the prisoners were arrested.

The Supervisors' special committee, appointed to examine into the charges preferred by Dr. Norris, President of the Charity Commission, to the effect that the supplies furnished by the contractors for the use of the poor, will meet at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

In the case of Marie Loretz against her husband John M. Loretz, the well-known organist, for divorce, Judge McCue denied the motion for alimony and counsel fees conditionally. The condition is that the case be tried during the March term of the City Court.

Commissioner Briggs, Treasurer of the Board of Police and Excise, will appear before the Excise Committee of the Board of Aldermen this evening to answer the charges of irregularities in the department preferred by Mr. Henry Everding, of No. 213 Court street.

Louisa Kern, aged fifty-nine, of New-Jersey avenue, between Atlantic and Flatbush avenues, fell on the ice at Liberty avenue at 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon, and died a few moments afterward from the effects of the fall. Deceased is supposed to have burst a blood vessel.

John Schiring, aged fifty-two years, of No. 34 Wolcott street, was arrested on Hamilton avenue at 6 o'clock last evening for intoxication, and locked up in the Tenth Precinct Station-house. A few minutes after 9 o'clock he was found hanging to the bars of his cell by a handkerchief. When cut down he was quite dead. Coroner Simms was notified.

## STATEN ISLAND.

A free lecture on the early history of Staten Island was delivered on the evening of the 16th inst., in New-Brighton, by Gen. Livingston Satterlee.

The first annual invitation ball of the Henry Eichenberger Association will take place on Monday evening next, at Dempsey's Library Hall, New-Brighton.

## NEW-JERSEY.

Michael Henry, a stone-breaker employed at a quarry in Weehawken, had his eye knocked out yesterday by a piece of flying stone.

Franklin Hall, corner of Montgomery and Warren streets, Jersey City, was damaged by fire yesterday morning to the extent of $300.

A passenger train and a freight train on the Morris and Essex Railroad collided yesterday morning near Chatham, seriously damaging the locomotives and forward cars of both trains. No one was injured.

Nicholas Berschemer was arrested in Newark yesterday for striking a boy named Christian Henselman on the head with a hatchet, inflicting a very dangerous wound. The prisoner is held to await the result of the boy's injuries, he being pronounced by his physician to be in a critical condition.

At 2:30 o'clock yesterday afternoon William Willicks, aged fourteen, was instantly killed while attempting to jump on a Morris & Essex railroad coal train at the Provost street crossing, in Jersey City. He fell under the wheels in such a position that his body was cut in two pieces. The body was conveyed to the residence of his parents, No. 28 Monroe street, Hoboken.

Lewis Daly, a young man residing in Jersey City, induced a boy named James Madigan to cut and steal some air-brakes from the cars of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and then informed the police of the theft with a view of securing the reward offered by the railroad company. Daly and Madigan were both arrested and held for examination.

A Montclair Railroad passenger train was thrown from the track by a broken rail near the depot, in Newark, yesterday morning. The train was composed of three cars, one of which, filled with passengers, was turned over into a ditch, but, strange to say, all the passengers escaped unhurt, with the exception of a few who were slightly injured by the splinters. The passengers were brought to the City by the next train.

Henry Drescher and Otto Fischer were arrested in Newark, yesterday, on a charge of being the ringleaders in a conspiracy against Simon Brothers, extensive bag manufacturers, of that city. The prisoners and a number of other workmen who were employed by the complainants in their factory, went on a strike five weeks ago and new men were employed to take their place. Lately the strikers have held several meetings, and the new men were notified to quit work or take the consequences. The Messrs. Simon are determined to prosecute the prisoners and any others